

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the grades hereinafter stated:

LIEUTENANTS

Thomas G. Lewis
Jack W. Welty

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

James W. Herb
Herbert F. Mills, Jr.

ENSIGNS

James H. Forbes, Jr.
Albert F. MacDonald, Jr.
Robert A. Weir

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from June 4, 1948:

Jack F. Andrus	Harold F. Knudsen
Wallace D. Baldwin	Francis P. Koval
Ernest M. Brides	Louis Kriser
Stanley H. Bueg	Louis F. Memoli
Samuel F. Catterlin	Thomas E. Reilly, Jr.
John A. Chalbeck	Ernest E. Rivers
Edward J. Cronin	Charles W. Safanda
Vernon L. Crow	Thomas W. Schaaf
William H. Elliott	William C. Sharp
Glenn E. Faucett	Donald K. Stitt
William M. Flynn	William R. Tappe
John C. Hammel, Jr.	Robert E. Tigner
Arthur W. Hanton	Craig McD. White
Harold R. Herndon	Eugene H. Whittlesley
Francis J. Hohl	George M. A. Willows
Lee S. Houchins	Arthur O. Wolf
Donald Hubbard	

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from June 4, 1948:

William Kleck, Jr.
Raymond D. Phillips
Harry L. Rimmer, Jr.

The following-named (civilian-college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

John W. Randall
"J" F. Stuart

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Billie J. Cole	Margaret E. Park
Joan T. Ernst	Elizabeth C. Riggs
Ferrell L. Greer	Agnes M. Roberts
Sarah C. Hargrove	Doris F. Travis
Betty J. Jones	Frances E. Weslowski
Elizabeth R. Meldahl	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Erik A. Johnson

LIEUTENANTS

Mitchell K. Disney	Carl E. Lundin, Jr.
Edward G. Grant	James H. Robertson
Frederic M. Lloyd 3d	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Kenneth S. Scott

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Garner L. Lewis	Robert E. Walsh
John B. Miller	Gilbert A. Webb
James T. Proctor	Arthur J. Wilets

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

ENSIGN

David R. Stutler

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Emma L. Gamble

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Jean B. Knecht
Mary E. Orlando
Mary A. E. Toepfer

ENSIGNS

Elizabeth E. Clark	Elizabeth G. Gaffney
Ethelyn E. England	Anna M. Steinmetz

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948:

Charles DeArmond
Robert P. Hilton
Wayne G. Shear

Richard E. Fahrenwald (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948.

Philip J. McEleney (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948.

George P. Edgerton (civilian-college graduate) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Glenn E. Drewyer
James P. Moran

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Jonathan M. Allen	Robert E. Rowand
William L. Chapman	Robert W. Sharp, Jr.
Holt B. Maddux	Charles R. Sullivan

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

George S. deShazo
William I. Gullett

LIEUTENANTS

Leonard M. Kraske
Jeremiah T. Sunde
Allan L. Wallace

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Luke J. Braxmeier
Gage Colby
Robert G. Martin

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy.

LIEUTENANTS

Eddy L. Harris
Ingrid C. Suess

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Louise J. Bartlett	Lillie M. Harwood
Jane H. Farr	Gayle M. Lang

ENSIGNS

Ann Belaëff	Marita D. Petit
Isabel V. Hunsecker	Charlotte S. Rasmusen
Hedwig L. Kratz	
Louise W. Sharp	

IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENTS TO TEMPORARY GRADE

To the temporary grade of major general
Oliver P. Smith

To the temporary grade of brigadier general
John T. Selden

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 1, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
Rev. Thomas G. Swales, pastor, Broad Street Methodist Church, Norwich, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we are conscious of the presence of Thy reality. We know that Thou art God, and from Thee we receive strength that will enable us to face life with all of its situations. Truly Thou art our refuge and strength and a very present help at all times. Help us to cast our burdens upon Thee, knowing

that Thou wilt sustain us, for Thou wilt not cause the righteous to be moved. We thank Thee that in the midst of uncertainty we can cling to the religious certainties of life. Help us to listen to the message Thou hast for us.

We pray that Thou wilt bless our President, our Speaker, and all others who have the privilege of guiding and directing the affairs of this great country of ours. Thou hast been our help in ages past, and we look to Thee for present guidance.

We thank Thee for hands to help bear the burdens of mankind, for eyes to see things as they are, for ears to hear the truth, and for minds to think through the facts that are presented to us. Help us to be open-minded. May we not be conditioned by our own selfish desires but motivated by high ideals.

We pray that we may continue to practice the Golden Rule of doing unto others as we would have them do unto us. Help us, Father, to be examples to those with whom we associate. We pray that we may be steadfast, always abounding in the love of God.

Grant us wisdom; grant us courage for the solving of the problems which confront us today. In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the President pro tempore had appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Army and the Air Force.
3. Department of Commerce.
4. Department of Justice.
5. Post Office Department.
6. Department of the Treasury.
7. Housing and Home Finance Agency.
8. National Archives.
9. Veterans' Administration.

THE BRITISH SOCIALISTS SAY "APRIL FOOL" TO UNCLE SAM

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, prior to the passing of ERP—Marshall plan—by the House of Representatives, the socialistic Government of Britain was just spending, so it was said, the last pound in the Exchequer. Now that ERP has been catapulted through the House on a wave of hysteria, the Socialist Government of Britain announces with gusto that the Government had a surplus of \$2,544,000,000 for the fiscal year which ended March 31, the very day ERP passed the House. This explains

why the proponents insisted that ERP pass before this British announcement came through. The British Socialists have pulled a fast April Fool's Day on the taxpayers of this country.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting in the Record the following article which appeared in the Washington Post of Thursday, April 1, 1948:

BRITAIN TAKES OVER ELECTRIC UTILITIES

LONDON, Thursday, April 1.—Britain took ownership last midnight of all the Nation's electric utilities, sixth major enterprise to be nationalized under the Labor government's Socialist program.

One of the first developments under state control will be higher rates for a large proportion of domestic consumers in urban areas.

Chairmen of 3 of the 14 regional boards that will administer the industry said domestic rates would have to be increased to meet rising costs, including higher prices for coal.

Other enterprises nationalized since the Labor government came to power in mid-1945 include coal, civil aviation, inland transport, the Bank of England, and cable and wireless.

Properties taken over by the Government included 170 generating stations and between 500 and 600 distribution systems employing 98,000 people.

Stockholders in private companies will be paid in Treasury stock, whose value will be announced tonight.

For municipally owned plants, the Government will pay only enough to meet net outstanding debts.

BRITAIN ANNOUNCES \$2,500,000,000 SURPLUS

LONDON, March 31.—The Treasury announced tonight the Government had a £363,000,000 (\$2,544,000,000) surplus for the fiscal year ended today.

It was double the surplus estimated last November.

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, the Congress established the Federal Home Loan Bank Board as the supreme court of the hundreds of savings and loan institutions in this country. The Board was set up for the protection of these institutions and their shareholders. That was the intent of the Congress. Unfortunately, however, the Board has been used as a political instrument for the private gain of the Democratic Party. It is shot through with politics, and some of the decisions of the Board are out-and-out bids for political support. It is no longer a free and independent agency, such as the Federal Trade Commission and other bureaus. I ask that the House investigate the political tampering with the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

There is so much internal wrangling in the Home Loan Bank Board that recently one of the Board members, Nathaniel Dyke, Jr., was dismissed because he refused to go along with policies with which he disagreed. The Dyke case, I believe, points up more clearly than anything I could say the weaknesses and the inevitable danger to savings and loan institutions inherent in the present structure

of the Home Loan Bank Board. The Board is in great need of drastic changes, and only the Congress can do that.

Until recently John H. Fahey was Chairman of the Board, which he ran with an iron fist. J. Alston Adams and Mr. Dyke were the other two members. The two Board members were, in effect, forbidden to participate in the Board's decisions. In fact, it was because Mr. Dyke, in at least one case, refused to go along with Mr. Fahey that he was dismissed.

This was the now-famous case involving the Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association which was taken away from its shareholders and placed in the hands of a conservator. Mr. Dyke objected to that high-handed method of treating a savings and loan institution. He saw no reason for such action, and he was not afraid to say so. Mr. Fahey and his henchmen then went to the White House and demanded the dismissal of Mr. Dyke. Mr. Dyke had had only an interim appointment, and he was not reappointed to the Board this year. It was one of the most cruel double crosses I have seen in many years, particularly in view of the fact that Mr. Dyke had been promised the chairmanship on the resignation of Mr. Fahey.

Curiously enough, the very things that Mr. Dyke fought for and the policies for which he argued have now been established by the Home Loan Bank Board. The Long Beach Savings and Loan Association has been returned to its rightful owners. Many other Dyke policies have since been adopted. Mr. Dyke's dismissal is a national disgrace.

The Dyke case calls attention to the hypocritical cry of the Truman administration that competent and responsible businessmen cannot be secured for Government service. Mr. Truman and those around him say that high-grade business executives refused to serve in Washington because of the low salaries paid Government workers. They say that these salaries are not sufficient to attract good men. Well, of course, that is not true either. It is just another political hoax being perpetrated on the American people. There are scores of able and wealthy business executives who are anxious to serve their country, but when they witness the shameful treatment of Mr. Dyke and others we cannot blame them for not coming to Washington.

Mr. Dyke is no job holder or seeker. On the contrary, the 6 years he served his Government in Washington cost him thousands of dollars out of his own pocket. He is a wealthy businessman from Little Rock, Ark. The financial returns of the best job in Washington could not possibly interest him. He came to Washington in 1942 to inquire about priorities for his vast lumber business and the first thing he knew they gave him a desk at the War Production Board and asked him to help solve the many lumber-production problems. Mr. Dyke readily agreed to the request. After that he was given one assignment after another because of his superior knowledge of the lumber, building-materials, banking, and home-financing in-

dustries. Mr. Dyke heads up some 20 different corporations from coast-to-coast dealing in these various types of businesses, which are really integrated under the heading of homes and the things that go into their construction and financing.

After he had completed his assignment with the War Production Board, Mr. Dyke was asked to serve as consultant to the War Mobilization Board. Later, he went over as consultant to the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and from there he went to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

In all of this period, from 1942 until the summer of 1947, Mr. Dyke received no compensation from the Federal Government. Living in Washington and trying to run his business on the side cost him money out of his own pocket, as I have said. In the summer of 1947 Mr. Dyke was made a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and for the first time accepted Government compensation which he was required to do by law. He did not last long, for he clashed almost immediately with Mr. Fahey over policies with which he disagreed. The final blow-up came when Mr. Fahey placed the Long Beach Association in the hands of a conservator.

Now I see by the papers that Mr. Dyke is being mentioned for a top executive job in the European relief program and in this connection I wish to insert in the Record a story from the American Banker of March 23, 1948:

DYKE POSSIBLE CHOICE TO ADMINISTER ERP AMERICAN BANKER BUREAU

WASHINGTON, March 22.—Nathaniel Dyke, Jr., formerly with the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, previously an adviser of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and during the war on the War Production Board, is being prominently mentioned as under White House consideration for administrator of the European relief program.

And another from the Washington Post of March 24, 1948, which appeared in the column of Jerry Klutetz:

Politics: Bumbling White House operators are trying to interest Nathaniel Dyke, Jr., in a top job in the European Relief Administration. The Dyke story is one of the reasons why the President finds it difficult to persuade good men to enter Federal service. Dyke was made a member of the Home Loan Bank Board and he was promised the chairmanship. The next thing he knew he was fired. Now the White House assistant who knifed him is talking him up for an ERA job.

Good men will be needed to run the ERP and they are going to be hard to find, only because of the disgraceful treatment of Mr. Dyke and others.

For Members of the House who are interested in a detailed account of the Dyke story, I suggest reading the back files of Banktrends, a Washington weekly newsletter edited and published by U. V. Wilcox, one of the country's outstanding financial reporters.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a resolution from the National Guard Association of Massachusetts.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech.

APRIL FOOL

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, when I pick up this morning's Washington Post and see that Britain last year made a \$2,544,000,000 surplus for the year ending March 31, 1948, and then think that this is the first day of April, called April Fool's Day, as far as the action on Congress is concerned, today might as well have been yesterday so far as fooling the American people. Britain has fooled our legislators.

At a time when I feel depressed, let me quote from Abraham Lincoln:

I do the best I know. The very best I can; and I mean to keep right on doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right, what is said against me won't amount to anything. If the end brings me out wrong, 10 angels swearing I was right would make no difference.

Still quoting, let me read you part of a poem by Ella Wheeler Wilcox:

Let those who have failed take courage,
Though the enemy seemed to have won,
Though his rank be strong, if he be in the wrong,
The battle is not yet done.
For sure as the morning follows
The darkest hour of night,
No question is ever settled
Until it is settled right.
O man bowed down with labor,
O woman young, yet old;
O heart oppressed in the toiler's breast,
And crushed by the power of gold,
Keep on with your weary battle
Against triumphant night;
No question is ever settled
Until it is settled right.

ERP was not a settlement; I am sure it was a colossal blunder by the Congress; a hardship on America; a real mistake. Time will tell.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on March 30, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] received permission to insert his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article. The Government Printing Office advises that it will exceed 2 pages of the RECORD and will cost \$177.50. The gentleman from Georgia is unavoidably absent this morning. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Eamon de Valera at the Mayflower Hotel the other evening.

XCIV—250

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Judge Eugene V. Alessandrini.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce endorsing statehood for Alaska.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Sacramento Bee.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

AMENDMENTS TO MARSHALL PLAN PROPOSALS

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, in the final hours of debate yesterday on the Marshall proposals, I proposed certain amendments which were adopted by the House and which will have far-reaching effects in the furnishing of relief by means of individual gift packages to needy people in Europe. Because of the shortness of time, I did not have an opportunity to fully explain the amendments, although they were accepted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I have inserted a statement in explanation of the amendments. This is contained on page 3849 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 31. I urge that the Members of the House read that portion of the RECORD.

The effect of these amendments is going to be that we will have a tremendous increase in the number of gift packages sent by individuals in this country to persons in the 16 Marshall plan countries of Europe. The amendments have the effect of reducing the postage rates on such packages by approximately 75 percent and making it mandatory that the governments of the participating countries change their laws so as to permit the tax-free entry of such relief packages.

By way of example, it should be pointed out that in many cases the postage rate on relief packages to Europe at present is as much as, or more than, the value of the article sent. For instance, the postage rate to occupied Germany from my home city of St. Paul, Minn., is 14 cents per pound. This means that it would cost \$3.08 to send a 22-pound package to Germany. Under the amendments to the ERP bill accepted by the House yesterday, the Administrator is required to provide for free transportation of such relief packages from the port of embarkation in America to the port of landing in Europe and to provide by the use of revolving-fund moneys set up under the plan for additional free transportation of such packages from the port of landing to the place of resi-

dence of the addressee. The sender of such a package pays the postage only from his home in the United States to the port of embarkation. Instead of paying \$3.08 as at present, the sender of a 22-pound package from St. Paul, Minn., would be required to pay only 74 cents. This is a reduction of more than 75 percent.

The inclusion of this provision in the bill will undoubtedly have the effect of encouraging more people to send more packages to Europe. This will mean quicker recovery and lessening of the financial burden on the Government of the United States.

The amendment adopted yesterday will serve another purpose. To wit, it will bring about the abolishment of import duties now imposed by many of the European countries on relief packages sent there since the amendment makes it a condition precedent to the receipt of the relief under the Marshall plan that the recipient countries agree with the Secretary of State for the free entry of such packages. In recent months many of these foreign countries have raised their import duties even on necessities of life such as food and clothing.

Since such a large portion of funds appropriated by the ERP bill go strictly to relief, as distinguished from rehabilitation projects, it is submitted that the proposals accepted yesterday are most meritorious in that they will bring about speedier relief in Europe and build up a great amount of good will through individual giving between peoples of America and destitute peoples of Europe.

I importune the House conferees on this bill to be adamant in their insistence that these worth-while amendments be retained in the bill when it goes into conference. The provisions of the Senate bill are not as intelligently generous in these provisions as are the terms of the House bill. It is urged that the conferees on the part of the House exercise their utmost faculties to insure the retention of these meritorious provisions of the bill.

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE DRIVE

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of us were shocked to learn through the radio and accounts of the morning press that certain alleged Negro leaders were advocating what they call a "civil disobedience drive" against any reinstitution of selective service or universal military training at this crucial time in the history of the world.

Since both Houses of Congress have by a substantial majority now approved the so-called Marshall or European recovery plan, it is now imperative that we take immediate steps to increase our military forces.

Recent acts on the part of high officials in the Democratic Party have greatly increased any racial tension that may have heretofore existed. We simply

must have unity now if we are to survive. The very last thing that any sincere American would want to do is to contribute to any already formidable problem. On the contrary, every true American should use every legitimate method to suppress and eradicate any influence that would tend to divide us.

We of the South admit that we have a race problem which we have been facing squarely. Although greatly handicapped by many impeding factors, progress is being made in the solution of race relationships. Sincere and effective efforts are being made to provide equal opportunities for education and gainful employment for the colored population. My colleagues in the Congress who represent various Southern States have always been acutely aware of the Negro problem and they have tirelessly worked for the Negro's advancement in every phase of life. Whether the fact is acknowledged or not, the best friends of the Negro are southerners of high principle who know the Negro better than any people in any other section of these United States could possibly know him.

The South has moved a long way in solving its Negro problem. That we have been moving in the right direction is evidenced by the fact that racial tension in the South, until the announcement by the President of his civil-rights program, is today at the lowest pitch in history, and understanding between Negroes and whites is growing day by day, year by year. Anything that tends to interrupt this ordered process of improvement constitutes a potential danger to the entire question of relations between the two races.

I repeat, interference is dangerous. Furthermore, interference can be disastrous when it is based—as it so often is—upon a complete lack of understanding of the problems of the South. That is why the President's recent message on civil rights has met with such opposition from southern Democratic leaders. For the President's civil-rights program includes those very measures that are designed to disrupt the entire southern approach to the racial problem. His acquiescence in the civil-rights affair was the major blunder of President Truman's otherwise excellent record as Chief Executive of the United States. We must believe that the President was poorly advised, that he did not weigh carefully the real import of his message or understand fully its consequences for the Democratic Party and the people of the South. Surely President Truman must realize that the southern race situation cannot safely be subjected to the Gordian knot technique. There is no short cut. There is no easy way. The problems that exist in the South between the Negro and white races will be solved to the full satisfaction of all concerned if the South is left alone to solve them without outside interference and pressure techniques.

Intelligent Negroes in the South recognize this fact. They do not interpret the barrage of racial propaganda from other sections as contributory and helpful to their uplift. On the contrary, they are seriously concerned lest the inflammatory schemes of the agitators undo all the progress that has been so

painfully achieved during the past three-quarters of a century. Those who agitate in the South for so-called civil rights are actually doing the Negro an irreparable harm.

Southern people are rightfully alarmed by the tendency to ignore the fact that there is a line which must not be crossed. We are anxious for the Negro to achieve equality of opportunity for education, for economic advancement, for culture. But that goal cannot be reached by an insistence on unrestricted social equality. Any recommendation which fails to recognize this fundamental fact must be regarded with distrust.

The President's recommendation for antidiscrimination legislation, in common with the programs of all the radical, left-wing communistic elements of the Nation, ignores this one essential condition. We must interpret the President's recommendation to mean the complete abolition of segregation among the races. Until it is acknowledged that segregation is the line which must not be crossed, the South cannot and will not accept any help, however well-intended, from people in other areas of the Nation.

We welcome any and all efforts to assist us and we believe that assistance can be extremely helpful—provided the basic principle of segregation is not menaced. We insist upon the recognition of the fact that the race situation in the Southland is not the same as the Negro situation in any northern State, and that the methods employed in many northern areas just will not work in the South. Segregation is the shield of southern culture and civilization. Once that shield is pierced the very life of the South is in danger. We welcome the assistance of any American citizen who is willing to recognize this one vital principle.

Yes, we can use help, but not the kind of help we are getting from President Truman, not the kind of help we are getting from the President's so-called civil-rights program, not the kind of help we are getting from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, not the kind of help we are getting from the Communist Party. We cannot use that kind of help. To paraphrase the President's own St. Patrick's Day speech: "The price is too high—we are not buying."

If these people want to help us, they can demonstrate their sincerity by working with us to build up the South economically. They can join our fight to eliminate unjust economic discriminations against the people of the South, discrimination against southern industry and agriculture in the form of inequitable freight rates. Let them pitch in and help the Southern States to develop their economic resources, promote expansion of southern industry, give southern agriculture an opportunity to compete on even terms with the rest of the Nation. The South's Negro problem is fundamentally a problem of education, and the South's education problems are fundamentally financial. Give us the opportunity, without interference and outside discrimination, to develop southern enterprise and raise the general standard of living among our people,

and the first step will have been taken toward a final solution of the problem of equal opportunity for Negroes.

If these organizations must fight for a cause, let them direct toward these ends the tremendous amount of time, money, and energy they are now devoting to their unholy crusade to break through the retaining wall of southern culture—segregation.

Within the concept of segregation, the people of the South are today bending every effort to provide equal opportunity for Negroes. We are moving rapidly toward the goal of equal educational opportunity. Southern States are spending more on Negro education than at any time in history. Increasing sums of money are being allocated for Negro health programs, hospitalization, social welfare, and recreation. This is both a difficult and a costly task, but we are determined to see it through. The South is rich in culture and potentialities, but the per capita monetary income in the States of the South is far below that of our more prosperous northern neighbors. An entirely disproportionate share of that per capita income is required to carry on public education for Negro and white alike. Our schools remain relatively poor in spite of the heavy tax burdens imposed for school purposes. The Southern States contain 28 percent of the population of the Nation, educate 32 percent of the children of the Nation, but receive only 8 percent of the national income on a per capita basis.

In spite of this staggering handicap, the people of the Southern States have made valiant strides toward improving social conditions. We shall not permit that progress to be jeopardized by either well-meaning but ill-advised interference, or communistic techniques of propaganda and agitation. Segregation is the line that must not be crossed. Segregation is the only sensible answer to the racial situation. American statesmen throughout our history have recognized this truth. Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln, two of our staunchest supporters of real civil rights, realized that the Negro and white races cannot live together peacefully except on the basis of segregation. The great Negro leaders have accepted and confirmed this view. Booker T. Washington deplored the efforts of those who sought to break the social barriers between Negro and white. He said:

In all things which are purely social, we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress.

We of the South are not indifferent to the welfare of the Negro. Long experience has convinced us that the Negro's welfare is best promoted in separate schools, separate churches, separate communities, separate railroad cars. We can be divided in these things, yet united in all things essential to mutual progress.

In these trying hours, our great country, which has been called the melting pot of the world, cannot survive unless all of us work and pray for the preservation of the principles which contribute to our strength and security.

BERLIN CUT OFF BY RUSSIA

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the very latest edition of the Washington News which carries the headline "Berlin cut off." The gist of the story is that the Soviet authorities have closed all rail and highway communications into the capital of Germany. I cannot imagine a more serious threat to the peace of the world, nor can I imagine a more direct challenge to the Congress of the United States. That challenge means that we must, without further delay, consider and pass legislation providing for the re-institution of selective service so that we may bring our armed forces up to their requisite strength and be prepared for any emergency.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

Mr. TRIMBLE (at the request of Mr. HAYS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SAME OLD MACLEISH

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Chicago Tribune entitled "Same Old MacLeish."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, a dizzy-headed poet, Archibald MacLeish, has sounded off condemning the House Committee on Un-American Activities. MacLeish came from my congressional district. For all of the fine patriotic people back home Mr. Speaker, I apologize for Mr. MacLeish's coming from that wonderful congressional district. He was a misfit there and went away.

For the balance of my minute, Mr. Speaker, let me bow my head and pray that he may some day recover from his dizziness and keep quiet until he does.

Be sure to read the Chicago Daily Tribune editorial of today, as follows:

SAME OLD MACLEISH

Archibald MacLeish, the poet whose native dizziness was heightened by the whirl given him by Mr. Roosevelt, has broken his vow of silence just when people were beginning to hope they had heard the last from him. MacLeish, in condemning the House Committee on Un-American Activities, states that the committee "has done more in a year and a half to breach the defenses of freedom and to introduce the wooden horse of terror into the United States than all the Communists on earth."

All the Communists on earth would presumably include Stalin's Russia, which has bowled over one helpless country after another in its avowed march toward world domination; the Communist Party in the United States, which is dedicated to the destruction of the Republic, and all of its agents and fellow travelers who are stirring up class, race, and religious hatreds, trying to subvert the labor unions, and engaging in a thousand and one other conspiratorial activities to wreck freedom in America.

MacLeish was never distinguished for good sense when he was busy helping Roosevelt gum up the war as head of the New Deal propaganda establishment called the "Office of Facts and Figures," as a self-appointed prophet of millennial informationalism while on the pay roll as Librarian of Congress, in his activities as Assistant Secretary of State, or in his capacity as an administration mouthpiece in the United Nations. He has, however, never made a sillier statement than his latest.

He is of such tender sensibility toward Communists that he overlooks what his political bedmate, General Marshall, calls the Communist "reign of terror" in Czechoslovakia in order to view goggle-eyed a fancied "terror" here. The Committee on Un-American Activities hasn't shot or sent anybody to jail out of hand. Only the Communists are doing that. All it has done is to turn up a lot of Communists in Government and elsewhere and to designate some bureaucrats who certainly are under obligation to explain why Communists are their chosen associates.

HENRY WALLACE

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished and amiable Professor Einstein is reported in the journals of the day to hold the theory that Henry Wallace can save us at home and abroad. It has often been noted that not more than a dozen persons can understand the Einstein theory.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 35]

Abblitt	Beall	Brooks
Allen, Ill.	Bell	Buck
Andersen	Bender	Buckley
August H.	Bland	Busbey
Andrews, Ala.	Bloom	Chapman
Andrews, N. Y.	Boykin	Clark

Clippinger	Hill	Passman
Cole, N. Y.	Holifield	Pfeiffer
Combs	Jackson, Calif.	Poulsen
Cox	Jarman	Rains
Cravens	Jenkins, Pa.	Ramey
Dawson, Ill.	Jennings	Reeves
Delaney	Kee	Richards
Dingell	King	Rivers
Dirksen	Lesinski	Rizley
Douglas	Ludlow	Rooney
Eaton	Manasco	Sadowski
Feighan	Mason	Sikes
Grant, Ala.	Miller, Nebr.	Stratton
Hartley	Morgan	Taylor
Harvey	Murray, Wis.	Thomas, N. J.
Havener	Norrell	West
Hébert	Norton	
Hendricks	Owens	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 359 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a brief announcement for the information of the Members. I understand it has now been definitely established that a message on the tax-reduction bill will be here at noon tomorrow, and it is expected that prompt action will be taken on that measure. It is possible that the conference action on the so-called foreign-aid bill will be completed today, in which event it is my hope that final action on the bill can be taken tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, on March 23 I obtained a unanimous-consent request to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a Lincoln Day address by Dr. Paul Austin Wolfe. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost \$195.25, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a mature appraisal of congressional feeling as the ERP debate came to a close was given by the veteran radio commentator, George Reedy, this morning. While I do not necessarily subscribe to the precise analysis of the motives given by Mr. Reedy, it is of interest to note his comments, which were as follows:

The European recovery program is now for all practical purposes the foreign policy of the United States. There are still disagreements to be ironed out and technicalities to be handled, but, basically, there

is no doubt that we are committed to the measure.

What little doubt may have existed was decisively removed last night. The bill was approved by one of the largest House votes in recent years. Nothing remains now except a get-together with the Senate over the final version of the legislation.

It may seem strange to those who remember the twenties that this country would ever approve such a bill. It has not been too long since the United States was definitely in the isolationist column. Americans wanted no part of Europe.

And yet today we are committed to rebuilding the shattered cities of the Old World and putting that continent back on its economic feet. Furthermore, we have taken that step knowing full well that it means depriving ourselves of many luxuries.

It is impossible to overestimate the historic importance of that decision. It goes far beyond any foreign-policy legislation ever proposed by the late President Roosevelt. It sets the United States upon a course never before tried by any nation.

Despite the overwhelming majority, the Members of the House did not vote for the bill with enthusiasm. To those around the Chamber yesterday, the uneasiness was obvious. Several legislators said openly they did not like the measure, but could see no other path.

That was the argument that clinched the final decision. It was not that every Member believed deeply in the European relief program. It was simply that most of them could see no alternative other than war. They decided to take the gamble.

Of course, the bill could never have been passed were it not for the fear of Soviet expansion. It should be stressed that the European recovery program is not the original Marshall plan. It has gone far beyond that stage.

The Marshall plan, as it was first proposed, was simply a program for rebuilding Europe. It was based on the idea that it was cheaper to get European economy running again than to go on giving hand-outs to the people of foreign countries.

Many shrewd observers of the political scene believe that measure could not have been jammed through Congress. They think it would have been defeated by a large vote. Something other than a recovery bill was needed to capture the vote.

That something other was provided by a mustached gentleman named Joseph Stalin. It was he and not Secretary of State Marshall who persuaded Congress to approve the Marshall plan. Had he kept a zipper on his lip, it might never have seen the light of day.

The measure that passed the House late yesterday was openly a bill to fight Communist imperialism. It was based on the belief that we should build up strong democratic countries in western Europe as a check to the Soviet Union.

The supporters of the bill believed privately that there was no other way of checking communism short of war. They admitted that it was a gamble, but they said that the gamble was worth taking. Only time will tell whether they were right.

At any rate, for good or bad, the United States has been committed to the program. We have set our sights on the goal of world leadership through the Marshall plan. Once on that path there is no turning back. We must walk it to the end.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States is now seriously considering the appropriation of billions of dollars to aid Europe, and millions for aid in other parts of the world. We contemplate expending large sums to strengthen the armed forces, inasmuch as this Nation is faced with problems that are world-wide and far-reaching and calculated to tax the statesmanship of the liberty loving people everywhere.

While all of this is going on, what do we find at home—here in the United States of America? On the 15th day of March this country was plunged into a coal strike, the results of which may rock the very foundations of our economic structure. The country is now faced with the sorry spectacle of one labor leader defying all orderly processes of Government. Is there anyone so naive as to believe for one moment that John L. Lewis is not responsible for the present coal strike? Is there any one who honestly believes that some 350,000 union members all decided to quit work simultaneously—without the guiding influence of John L. Lewis? No, that labor leader is defying the law of the land, and the administration is faced with the solemn responsibility of acting under the law in the interest of the people.

I have looked into the matter and in order that the record may be clear I shall briefly summarize the issues involved in this coal strike: A collective bargaining agreement was entered into and became effective the first of July 1947. In that agreement there was a provision which permitted the so-called welfare fund to be financed by collecting from the producers of coal throughout the land the sum of 10 cents per ton on every ton produced. This was to be an irrevocable trust fund, and the representatives of the coal mine owners named a trustee; the representatives of the union named a trustee—none other than Mr. Lewis—and those two trustees named a third or neutral trustee, as provided by law. The coal mine owners who made the contract, delegated to the trustees the sole responsibility for working out a plan by which pensions, death benefits, and other welfare contributions should be made to those entitled to receive them. Mr. Lewis, according to the record, has insisted that all members of his union should become the beneficiaries of this fund. The law clearly requires that only employees of employers parties to the contract are entitled to benefits from this fund. The trustee representing the coal mine owners is on record as saying that Mr. Lewis is demanding benefits for some thirty to forty thousand men who are not entitled to receive such benefits, since they are not employed by the very persons who are paying the bill. Therefore, in utter disregard of the provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, Mr. Lewis is demanding that the law be violated.

This is an intricate subject—as are all trust agreements. However, private actuaries were employed to make a study of this matter and upon receipt of their reports Mr. Lewis rejected their conclusions because they did not sustain his contentions. Thereupon, the Social Se-

curity Administration of the United States was asked to make an actuarial study and it did so, but Mr. Lewis has completely ignored that study, because in all of its main provisions it sustained the privately made study, and again did not support Mr. Lewis' contentions. This is a matter of record and has been stated by the trustee representing the coal operators—the fund is not sufficient to grant the demands of Mr. Lewis that all miners reaching the age of 60, who have served 20 years, shall be entitled to a pension of \$100 per month.

The contract expires on the 30th of June 1948. Over \$30,000,000 are now in this fund, and the matter is deadlocked because Mr. Lewis cannot have his way.

The third or neutral trustee has resigned his assignment as of January 1, 1948, declining to accept the full responsibility of this question, and Mr. Lewis has publicly stated that the whole matter could have been satisfactorily concluded had the third or neutral trustee decided with him. This is begging the question simply because any money could be disposed of as long as everyone acceded to Mr. Lewis' wishes.

The record shows that Mr. Lewis has failed to join hands with the trustee representing the operators in the naming of another neutral trustee; consequently the trustee representing the mine owners has gone into the Federal court, in accordance with the provisions of the law, and requested the court to name a third or neutral trustee.

What about the coal-mine owners? I am advised they have repeatedly offered to meet and discuss with Mr. Lewis any grievance he might have whenever he returns the men to work. The contract entered into between the contracting parties clearly provides that any grievance or dispute shall be handled by the contracting parties as it has been the custom for many years not to discuss disputes while the men are out on strike. Lewis now ignores this practice.

This action on the part of one labor leader is giving aid and comfort to those elements in our national life that would weaken and destroy our system of Government. Lewis has defied the Board of Inquiry created by the President under the provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. These are all the facts on record. Charges that stand unanswered of record before the President's Board of Inquiry.

I want it made clear that I am as appreciative as any man in this Congress of the benefits John L. Lewis has brought to the coal miners. In fact, it was the deplorable conditions under which these miners lived and worked that made a John L. Lewis possible.

A John L. Lewis who was able to effectuate his just demands against the coal operators is the same John L. Lewis who now defies the legally constituted authority of the Government.

This Congress should understand that chaos faces the Nation if this strike continues many more days. Already transportation services have been curtailed, steel plants are closing down part of their operations; the European relief program is being jeopardized, and I for one do not believe that the great United States

Government is so impotent as not to be able to handle this ruthless labor leader in such a manner as to restore the production of coal.

Lewis, of course, denies that he has called a strike, but when he writes to his membership using violent language, what can they do—they are well trained—but follow their master, and they have without doubt complied with that intention.

Much of the present discussion concerning the current strike has centered around the question of whether or not the national emergency provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 are adequate to handle the United Mine Workers once and for all.

First. We will not know for some time whether or not the Taft-Hartley Act is adequate to deal with the current strike. The House should realize that its application by the present administration leaves much to be desired. The emergency strike provisions were designed to be administered rapidly in order to achieve the objectives of the act. That these provisions have not been administered rapidly is no fault of this House or its Committee on Labor.

Second. This House should realize that the emergency strike provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act were designed to delay strike action while reasonable men could arrive at an honest agreement on wages, hours, and other conditions of employment.

The time has come for us to consider legislation designed to drive Lewis into a position where his arbitrary actions are impossible.

It so happened that the original Hartley bill, as passed by this House, contained adequate provision, not only to end the current coal strike, but also to end, once and for all, the threat of John L. Lewis and other labor bosses of his type.

These provisions were redrafted into a new bill, which I introduced yesterday.

In explanation, I want to point out that every provision in this legislation has already been approved by the House of Representatives at the time you passed the original Hartley bill.

These provisions include:

First. A definition of monopolistic strikes.

Second. A provision making such monopolistic strikes unlawful concerted activities.

Third. Amendments to the Clayton Act permitting the Department of Justice to prosecute instigators of monopolistic strikes under the Sherman anti-trust law.

I hope the Members of this body will consider this legislation carefully.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper clippings.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain newspaper articles, excerpts, and editorials.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Alabama State Board of Public Welfare.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include letters and telegrams.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be confined to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman's request is not to exceed 2 hours for general debate?

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. CANNON. And if debate can be concluded in less time, less time will be used?

Mr. TABER. That is right; just as little as possible.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6055, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries \$332,407,000 of direct appropriations for activities of the Government, \$14,000,000 for judgments and authorized claims, and \$200,000,000 in reductions of appropriations. The appropriations are \$66,000,000 below the budget and the reductions in appropriations \$50,000,000 above. There is also \$150,000,000 for contract authorizations, and several transfers of Navy funds.

I am going to take up first the item in the bill which I believe more Members are interested in than any other, that is, the item relating to the Veterans' Administration, although it is a comparatively small item.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Before the gentleman leaves the over-all figures, I should like to ask, because I do not find them specifically mentioned in the report, what is the total amount of cash appropriations and what is the total amount of contract authorizations carried by the bill?

Mr. TABER. The total amount, including contract authorizations, approximates \$500,000,000.

Mr. CANNON. That is the authorizations or the total?

Mr. TABER. Contract authorizations and cash. The cash appropriation is \$346,000,000.

Mr. CANNON. What amount in this bill is authorized to be transferred from other funds?

Mr. TABER. There is about \$5,000,000. I do not have the exact figure in my head, but it is about that amount.

Mr. CANNON. What amount of receipts which otherwise would be covered into the Treasury are authorized for expenditure by this bill?

Mr. TABER. I do not know that any receipts that would otherwise be covered into the Treasury are involved here. There might be, but I do not have the figures in my head.

Mr. CANNON. What about the Maritime Commission? Is not it authorized to use certain receipts?

Mr. TABER. Yes, it is authorized to use an amount that runs a little over \$4,000,000. I am just guessing at it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The amount of receipts authorized to be used is, I think, \$17,600,000 for the Maritime Commission.

Mr. CANNON. What amounts in this bill are replacements of cuts made in previous appropriation bills?

Mr. TABER. A very small amount, comparatively: I would say maybe six or seven million dollars over all.

The veterans situation came to a head as a result of a letter that went out to the Office of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the 16th of January reducing the personnel of the Veterans' Administration in their Administrative Section. We had the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] before the committee on some resolutions they had introduced. We had General Gray, the Administrator, and Mr. Clark, Assistant Administrator, and Mr. Moore, the comptroller, and Mr. Sweet, the personnel officer. General Gray told us he felt he did not have the funds to take care of some needed activities which he wished to carry on through the balance of this fiscal year. We went into the matter very thoroughly. Finally he reached the point where he

said that he would like to have authority to put on 3,000 additional personnel. We figured the cost based on that particular type of personnel would be in the neighborhood of \$10,500,000 a year. So as to be on the safe side for the 3 months from April 1 to July 1, we made it \$3,000,000, so that there would be enough money to cover it. He went to work on it immediately. He has already increased the number of personnel in the Medical Department by 1,200 and the administrative end by 800. He told me he thought that that would take care of the situation.

It was the intention of the committee that the needed personnel for administration should be put back into the Veterans' Administration. It was not the intention, nor do I believe it is the intention of the House, that we carry personnel that are not needed or are not doing the job and rendering useful service. My understanding is that there has been some hesitancy on the part of the Veterans' Administration in putting back contact employees. My attitude, and I think the attitude of the Committee on Appropriations, is that where these contact people are needed to bring about efficient administration that they should be put back or put in whether they are in now or not. I expect that the Administrator will do that. That is what we had in mind when we laid this picture out: that needed things would be done; that the most pressing things would be done. I want to see the claims set-up handled in such a way that the veterans' claims will be taken care of thoroughly and promptly. Where they need contact men, I want to see them put in.

I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has by his last remarks, I believe, conveyed information to the Members on a matter in which they are very generally interested; namely, the contact representatives. My understanding is that included in these \$3,000,000 is enough money for the Administrator to keep employed necessary contact representatives in all parts of the country, is that correct?

Mr. TABER. In every part of the country where they are needed. There are a thousand open positions that the Administrator has not so far filled out of the 3,000 that was allowed him.

As I understand it, according to the Legion statement that I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts brought with him, or if not him, then it was the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] it would take 600 to cover what they thought was needed in the contact picture. Maybe I am wrong on that but that is the way I remember it; but in any event there is plenty of money in there to do it.

Mr. McCORMACK. And as far as the Appropriations Committee is concerned they expect the Administrator to keep contact representatives in the various of-

fices and suboffices where they are necessary.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. Does the gentleman understand that out of those 8,500 employees of the Veterans' Administration who were let go under this directive to take effect March 31, that these same employees will be rehired or retained?

Mr. TABER. Insofar as the positions that they previously occupied are concerned. I would hardly expect that a man who was engaged in an administrative capacity would be reemployed as a nurse, but insofar as the position he previously occupied is continued, yes.

Mr. KEARNEY. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that, for the reason that only this morning I was advised that they were not going to retain the employees who were discharged but were going to leave the field open and go out throughout the country and hire new ones.

Mr. TABER. That was not my understanding of what should be done.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The figures that I have show that 725 contact positions will be lost or have been lost by the reduction of the VA personnel. I think the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will bear me out in the belief that General Gray does not intend to replace many of those contact men. I think General Gray is very able but he is very new in the Veterans' Administration. I will say I do not think General Gray realizes that the contact man is the first touch that the veteran has with the Veterans' Administration. That man helps him file his claim at once and as the Members of the House know, many of the veterans cannot get any compensation prior to the time that he files his claim.

General Gray has spoken of using itinerant men. How much good is an itinerant man going to be going to many places a hundred miles apart? How much time could he spend on each disabled veteran?

I believe General Gray testified to the Appropriations Committee that he had a thousand jobs now that he could fill, plus the \$3,000,000 and plus, I understand, the understanding that the appropriations would give him a certain amount to pay for the terminal leave of these men, then you would have plenty of jobs for these contact men and for a good many other persons.

Can the gentleman give me any idea as to what will happen there?

Mr. TABER. Whatever there is of a requirement for terminal leave for any positions that are carried along where the funds are not available will be provided for in the general 1949 appropriation bill. There is plenty of money now to put back any of the contact men who are needed with this appropriation we are providing now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman from New York that I asked General Gray this morning when he appeared before the Veterans' Affairs Committee the direct question whether if we gave him this \$3,000,000 he would reemploy these 3,000 people or what percentage would be put back into contact work. I understood him to say "None," that they were going to use it first for medical, claims, insurance, and rehabilitation.

Many of us on the Veterans' Affairs Committee think that certainly a substantial percentage out of this \$3,000,000 should be used to put back contact representatives. Will the gentleman from New York tell me what the feeling of his committee was when they granted this \$3,000,000 with reference to contact men?

Mr. TABER. We went into the picture very carefully with General Gray, and General Gray told us that he thought 3,000 would give him the ones that were needed to carry on the job and do it thoroughly. We understand that that would allow him to put back any contact men that were needed and any claims men that were needed. He told us, and we have been advised, that this insurance picture does not head up until after the Supreme Court makes a decision, therefore there is no sense in building up that matter at this time.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Quoting from the hearings, General Gray was asked by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]:

If you were given this \$6,000,000 that is called for in the resolution offered by Mr. McCORMACK and Mrs. ROGERS, what would you do with it?

General GRAY. I would put back some of the people who are now being separated.

Mr. KEEFE. How many?

General GRAY. I can only casually estimate that; I would say somewhere around 2,000—2,500—under 3,000.

Further in response to a question from the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]:

So that if Congress appropriated to you \$2,500,000 to \$3,000,000 to carry these 3,000 personnel, whom it is now contemplated to dismiss from the rolls, will you be able with those 3,000 employees to furnish the essential and necessary and decent services to the veterans?

General GRAY. Yes, sir.

I think it is clear therefore that we have provided all that General Gray feels he needs for essential services to our veterans.

Mr. TABER. That was my understanding, and that was the intention of the committee.

Mr. PEDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. PEDEN. In view of the statement made by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], with respect to the testimony of Gen-

eral Gray this morning that he did not intend to replace some of these necessary contact officers, would it be advisable in expressing the true intent of Congress to put into this bill after the word "Administration" the words "including necessary contact officers" in which case we would be assured that the Administrator would follow the intent as you have expressed it that we believe the necessary contact officers should be included in this \$3,000,000?

Mr. TABER. I should not object to that amendment, but I think that this discussion which we are presently having on the floor here would be sufficient to call it to the attention of the Administrator that it is the intention of the committee and the Congress to have that done. There seems to be no discordant note here on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. I want to make this perfectly clear. I think it is clear already from what the gentleman has said. In the event these contact officers that are necessary are not restored, it is wholly the fault of the Veterans' Administration and not because the veterans committee or the Congress have not given to General Gray the money asked for in this connection, is that correct?

Mr. TABER. That is my understanding.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSS. I think we should have this clarified here. This appropriation is being granted for the purpose of reinstating some of the employees that are about to be dismissed because of an order recently issued, is that correct?

Mr. TABER. Well, partly. It is also for the purpose of permitting the Administrator to put to work necessary people in the medical set-up that he feels are especially urgent. He has placed 1,200 additional people at work in that set-up already.

Mr. ROSS. That is what I would like to have clarified. When General Clay was before the committee this morning I asked him if the bulk of this money was not to be used for employing personnel for the medical division, and his answer was "Yes." I asked him further if a number of the employees who have been dismissed and who will be reinstated would be negligible, and he said "Yes."

Mr. TABER. I think perhaps that might be so.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The House should fully understand, and the employees of the Veterans' Administration who might have been given notice of separation should fully understand, that General Gray emphasized the fact that he was

not willing to say to Congress that he was going to employ the identical people who were threatened with separation from the service. He was against the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], because, he said, it would require him to freeze those particular people in jobs, and he was not willing to do that. He is going to take the \$3,000,000, and with that he said he could meet the situation. That is the action of the committee.

Mr. TABER. That is what we understood.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. When the testimony was heard by the Veterans' Committee emphasis was placed on the fact that these contact officers that had exceptionally heavy case loads, that were rendering an exceptionally good service should be retained. These veterans live out in the districts and some of them cannot get into the central office without sacrifice of time and money, necessitating even several days off from their work to get the service. Do I understand the committee by granting this additional appropriation means that those contact officers with heavy loads, that were rendering these outstanding services, should be continued?

Mr. TABER. That is my understanding; that where these people are rendering a necessary and effective service, they should be cared for.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In General Gray we recognize a very capable administrator, and I am wondering whether or not he indicated to the committee that there was any reorganization of the Veterans' Administration anticipated at the moment.

Mr. TABER. Well, there are some of these branch offices that he has not made up his mind about. I gathered that he certainly did not intend to increase the number, and that he hoped to reduce the number, and transfer some employees and put them where they were more needed.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that some of the employees discharged as of April 1 were probably undesirable employees?

Mr. TABER. That is probably so.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSS. It was stated before the Veterans' Committee that in this personnel reduction no members of the Medical Division would be terminated.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. ROSS. That no members would be terminated under this recent reduction. Now we have additional appropriations being granted and most of the funds will be used for new employees who will be placed in the Medical Di-

vision. I just do not think that it should go out to the country that the Congress is now appropriating \$2,000,000 for the reemployment of 3,000 of the 8,500 that were terminated, and then not have that done.

Mr. TABER. We did not understand that that was to be the result. As I understand, 1,200 have been put in the medical service and 800 in the administrative service down to this time.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Under the reductions recently announced, certain adjudication boards were eliminated, or the number reduced. Was there any discussion as to whether those adjudication boards would be restored? That is a vital point.

Mr. TABER. As I understand, where they were needed they would be put back.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Was there any explanation given as to where they were needed?

Mr. TABER. We did not go into the details of places that they were to be put, but we were told that where they were needed they would be put back.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Does it appear to the gentleman that it is excusable to take 2 months after a veteran is examined before the adjudication board can act on his claim?

Mr. TABER. It is not.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Well, that has happened in some cases.

Mr. TABER. Well, it should not happen.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MATHEWS. Just to get the matter straight, it is my understanding that the appropriations made here are not made for the purpose of retaining particular people in particular jobs, but are given by the Committee on Appropriations to the Veterans' Administration to do the best possible job of service to the veteran as the Administration sees fit.

Mr. TABER. To do the things that he said were necessary to do to make the job effective.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. As I understand, the Committee on Appropriations has not undertaken to run the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2202) entitled "An act to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world," with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; that it disagree to the amendment of the House to the title; that it agree to the conference asked by the House; that it insists upon its amendment and asks a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. WILEY, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. GEORGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1948

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world, disagree to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the text of the bill, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Ohio if he noted in the morning paper that Britain on March 31 had a credit balance of \$2,544,000,000? I am wondering whether the gentleman knew that before we passed this bill last night.

Mr. VORYS. We are taking notice of that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. EATON, VORYS, MUNDT, BLOOM, and KEE.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on this bill may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6055, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I was present at the veterans' committee meeting this morning when General Gray appeared and indicated that the greatest need of the Veterans' Administration is for men in the medical service to take care of our disabled veterans. He also pointed out that every veterans' organization had contact men in practically every community in the United States. So I do not want this record to leave the impression that General Gray is injuring the service by seeing that these men get proper medical treatment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to take only a few minutes more to run through a little bit of this bill. I am not going to attempt to discuss it fully because the time for general debate will not permit.

We have carried \$150,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission contract authorization. We have carried a \$75,000,000 increase in the fund for rural electrification. We have carried \$143,000,000 for going ahead with the feeding of the occupied territories in Germany, Austria, Japan, and Korea. We have an item here for the construction of a road in Alaska, involving \$11,000,000. We have authorized the continuation, without interruption, of the vessel-operating functions of the Maritime Commission to the end of the fiscal year as provided for in the act of February 27, 1948. We have some minor items in the Bureau of Reclamation totaling \$1,600,000. We have an item of \$10,000,000 for the putting of the new uniform in the Air Force. That will cost us net about \$2,500,000, according to the testimony that was given. For rivers and harbors we have a few emergency items totaling about \$2,000,000. There are some items for the Post Office Department, due to the increase in the volume of mail. There are also a few items for the State Department.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The gentleman made reference to the new uniforms for the Air Force. I have been in consultation with the Air Force on the matter and am hopeful that this is predicated upon a gradual attainment of the new uniform over a period of years, based upon usage and wear of the old uniforms.

Mr. TABER. It is.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, to those who make a hobby of collecting exceptional congressional papers, I recommend the retention of this committee report. In inadequacy, circuitous indirection, and lack of pertinent

information, it is probably without parallel in the annals of the Congress.

To begin with there is the most astonishing omission in this report. There is no over-all summary. In every committee report down to the Eightieth Congress you will always find in an introductory paragraph near the beginning of the report a summation which analyzes and digests the bill and the report.

You will look in vain for any such summary, either at the beginning of this report or elsewhere. I do not recall having seen a committee report a bill, especially on an important bill of this kind, where you could not find even the total amount carried by the bill until you put a slide rule and an adding machine on it, and even then be certain as to whether you had not overlooked something.

What is the purpose of a report. The purpose of the report on an appropriation bill is to indicate how much is appropriated, for what purpose it is appropriated, and in what way the funds are to be expended. There is nothing in this report which gives you any such analysis.

For example, you will not find in this report any statement anywhere as to the total amount appropriated and authorized for commitment and expenditure. I do not recall ever having seen a report that did not give that information by way of preface. If you will turn to page 24 of the report and add the totals of title I and title II, you get \$346,629,152.23. Apparently, we are to understand that this is the total amount carried in the bill.

But as a matter of fact when you go through the bill item by item and take all the appropriations, reappropriations, contract authorizations and authority for reallocations, you find that this bill totals something in the neighborhood of \$600,000,000. In other words, approximately twice as much as we would be led to believe is carried in the bill if you work out your own arithmetic on a basis of the figures at hand. So that the average Member coming on the floor and picking up the report will be surprised to find, when the whole thing is worked out, that the bill really carries approximately twice what it appears to carry on the face of this report.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Is there anything under the rules which would prevent the minority from filing minority views if they do not like the majority report?

Mr. CANNON. I do not recall having seen a minority report on an appropriations bill of this character.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It can be filed, though, can it not?

Mr. CANNON. It is not done. The majority with their staff of experts, and all facilities at hand, are always depended on to write the report.

I was surprised when the chairman said in answer to my question that only about \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 in the bill

is for replacements of cuts made in former bills. If you go through this bill, you find that practically half of the new obligatory availability is directly due to the need for restoration of amounts previously claimed as economies. In other words, this committee has ever since the beginning of the Eightieth Congress been operating in many instances on the installment plan. The departments come before the committee and demonstrate the need of definite funds and the committee arbitrarily cuts the appropriation below the amount on which the department can operate, and then tells the country that we have made a saving.

And when the money falls short of the requirements of the department the committee brings in a deficiency or supplemental appropriation which absorbs or more than absorbs the so-called economies.

The last deficiency bill passed here in the House was made up principally of such restitutions. And a large part of this bill is made up of such items.

These appropriations by installments do not save a thin dime. On the contrary, they involve additional and unwarranted cost to the Government. Additional work is shouldered on the Federal agencies and the Congress in the repeated processing of these "come back" estimates. Budget staffs are burdened unnecessarily with additional work and the committees and the two Houses must without profit devote valuable time and energy to these repetitious proceedings. And we end up by restoring the funds arbitrarily denied without supporting factual data.

Mr. TABER. Would the gentleman point out one such item as that?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly. Here, for example, is the amount restored for Government relief in occupied areas. And here is something like \$75,000,000 of delayed funds for the postal service. And there is a very substantial amount here for replacement of cuts in the provision for the Atomic Energy Commission. And here is money for the replacement of arbitrary cuts in the replenishment of the working capital of the Government Printing Office. Just these items alone will total something like \$295,000,000 instead of the \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 which the gentleman assured us just now would include all replacements for cuts made in previous appropriation bills and heretofore to the country as savings and economies.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to my chairman, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. There was no cut in the contract authorization of atomic energy. Heretofore the cuts in the Post Office were not in the items to any extent that are involved in this deficiency, and there were no substantial cuts in appropriations that have been restored in this bill. There were a few small items, maybe six or seven millions.

Mr. CANNON. Instead of six or seven millions there are in round figures \$295,000,000 of restored cuts in the four items alone.

I have here figures supplied by the Budget Bureau which show that the original and supplemental estimates for the Post Office Department were \$1,707,473,000. The amount appropriated so far is \$1,605,934,000. And the pending supplemental estimate is \$141,319,000, of which about \$75,000,000 is to replace cuts. The Bureau says about \$75,000,000 of the supplemental appropriation requests is considered as needed to offset the cuts by the Congress.

On the Atomic Energy Commission item, the original and supplemental estimates were for a total of \$250,000,000. Of this the committee recommended and Congress appropriated \$175,000,000, leaving a deficit of \$75,000,000. The Budget Bureau says:

These figures exclude \$250,000,000 in contract authorizations requested by the President, approved and enacted. Instead of requesting additional appropriations to make up for the appropriation cuts, a supplemental request for \$150,000,000 additional in contract authorizations has been submitted—revision of original request of \$200,000,000.

The chairman does not refer to the \$2,000,000 cut made in the working capital of the Government Printing Office and here restored in part, or to the \$5,000,000 here restored in cuts from the appropriation for Government relief in occupied territory. All these are official figures from the Bureau of the Budget and aggregate roundly \$295,000,000, instead of the six or seven mentioned by the chairman.

No attempt is made in the report to summarize the contract authorizations. What is a contract authorization? It is an authorization to enter into a commitment, to create an obligation, which must ultimately be paid by appropriations. That is not economy. The mere fact that you say: "Now, instead of giving you the money I will authorize you to go ahead and make a contract and when the contract eventuates I will pay the money," is in effect an appropriation. And eventually an appropriation must be made to pay it. It is in no sense a saving or an economy.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. As a matter of fact that technicality of contract authorization was conceived under the brilliant leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri when he was chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Now the gentleman is criticizing his own child.

The gentleman is abandoning his own idea and criticizing his own brain child.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly. We frequently used the contractual authorization when warranted. But the gentleman cannot point to a single instance in which we tried to represent to the country that we were saving money by deferring the day of reckoning.

By way of recapitulation, Mr. Chairman, the amounts carried in this bill for Government relief of occupied areas, the postal service, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the working capital of the Government Printing Office, and not in-

cluding other similar but smaller amounts, total approximately \$295,000,000 of restored cuts, which at the time were represented as savings. It now turns out they were not savings at all, and we are in this bill restoring them.

Let me emphasize. When you add this \$295,000,000 of restored cuts to prior restorations and the corresponding economies claimed at the first session of the Eightieth Congress, you will have dissipated claimed savings to the extent of upward of \$1,100,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I shall only speak briefly, but I do want to add a word with reference to the \$3,000,000 item which is recommended by your committee for the Veterans' Administration. That is an item in which many of us have been very much interested and which has created considerable concern in New England.

As has been pointed out, General Gray has assured your committee that, with the shifts in personnel which he can make and which he intends to make promptly from places where there may be excess personnel to places where there may be too little personnel, he can, in his opinion, with the money here recommended, provide all essential services for our veterans.

To my friends in New England I may add that General Gray has also testified that New England has been shown to be undermanned, and that the situation there is to be dealt with promptly.

Now, just to keep the record straight, I want to make one or two brief observations.

First, it has been represented in veteran circles that the proposed cut on March 31 was the result of the failure by the Congress to provide sufficient funds for the fiscal year 1948.

That, Mr. Chairman, is not the fact. The proposed cut resulted primarily from the recommendations of the President in respect to the fiscal year 1949, which are substantially below appropriations for the fiscal year 1948, and the determination of the Veterans' Administration to conform to the proposed reduction in personnel, not on July 1, but 3 months in advance of that date, on March 31.

Let me quote in this connection from a statement that I made on the floor of the House on June 17, 1947, as chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1948, when this appropriation was under consideration:

I want to emphasize as the report emphasizes that no recommendation made contemplates any cut in any benefit provided by the Congress for our veterans; that no recommendation contemplates any cut in financial assistance to the disabled, to the widowed, to the orphaned, or in medical care for those who are eligible.

And, again:

The record is clear that the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress have not denied one cent or one employee requested for hospitals.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, we all know that the Congress with respect to the fiscal year 1948 in the medical field made available not only every cent that was requested from the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate but in addition thereto the sum of \$20,000,000.

Second, it has been represented in veteran circles that the proposed cut on March 31 was due to the fact that representatives of the Veterans' Administration had been told by the Appropriations Committee of the House that they could not come back for a deficiency appropriation.

That, Mr. Chairman, is not the fact. The representatives of the Veterans' Administration who made the assertion have admitted on the record before your committee that they can find nothing in the record to justify that statement.

I have been a member of the committee for many years. I do not recall any such statement being made at any time to the Veterans' Administration or any other agency of this Government.

I know it is unnecessary to state that the Congress will always provide whatever funds are shown to be necessary for the proper care of our veterans.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. In my section of the country there has been a good deal of talk that the reduction in personnel in district offices is done deliberately by the Veterans' Administration in order to build up the few larger offices. Will the gentleman state whether or not that is the opinion of the committee?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I cannot answer the gentleman categorically. I may state, however, that in the New England area it appears that the cut of last summer, which was limited strictly to administrative personnel and which amounted to about 5 percent for the country as a whole, was for unexplained reasons applied by the Deputy Administrator in charge of the New England branch office in such a manner that the regional office in Boston took a cut of about 9 percent and the regional office in Providence a cut of 13.3 percent, as compared with a cut in his own branch office of .04 percent.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MATHEWS. May I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for the statement he has just made before this Committee? I think it was confirmed by the statement of General Gray before the Veterans' Affairs Committee this morning that practically all, if not all, the cuts in personnel were made by him to adjust the Administration to the coming, contemplated cut recommended by the President's budget. I think the gentleman has made that clear. I think the Committee ought to understand it and I hope they do.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The hearings also bear out that fact. I may say to the gentleman that I personally would like to thank him and the chairman and the other members of the subcommittee for the very fine and considerate hearing they gave the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and me when we appeared on our resolutions. Our resolutions called for \$6,000,000 in order to put back the personnel displaced by the Veterans' Administration, because we feared these employees might not be taken back if the appropriation was not earmarked in some way and there was a ruthless displacing of splendid personnel.

May I ask the gentleman this question: Does the gentleman remember that General Gray said:

The skin back to March 31 was done for the purpose of taking care of the payment of terminal leave and separation, etc.

So, of course, when the Appropriations Committee authorized the payment of \$3,000,000, the report goes on to say, the terminal leave will be taken care of in the 1949 budget, so in effect General Gray will have more than the \$3,000,000 to spend for personnel. Is not that true?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think my colleague from Massachusetts is correct. The 3,000 personnel who are provided for up to the end of the fiscal year will, of course, either be provided for in the fiscal year 1949 or will be taken care of in that year as to terminal leave.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But there will be no skin back now, so no money would be taken back for that.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. My understanding also is that there will be other money that will be put into the 1949 appropriation for terminal leave.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There will have to be additional money for the fiscal year 1949 over and above the President's recommendation either for salaries or for terminal leave.

The effect, Mr. Chairman, of approving the recommendation of your committee and allowing \$3,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration is to authorize the retention for the time being on the rolls of the Administration of some 3,000 more persons than are recommended by the President in respect to the fiscal year 1949, and to give General Gray the force which he says is necessary to cover all essential services for our veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CROW. I want to clear up one point the gentleman raised in regard to coming to the Appropriations Committee for a deficiency appropriation. Before our committee this morning Mr. Moore, the budget officer of the Veterans' Administration, testified that the letter of

instructions came from the executive department to live within that budget and not ask for a deficiency appropriation. It did not come from the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. That of course is an entirely different thing from the charge that has been made that the instructions came from the committee.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I wonder if the gentleman would assure me about one item on page 11 of the bill at line 19 calling for the appropriation of \$35,000 for the Department of the Interior. Will that make possible the continuation of the publication of the fish marketing reports?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am aware of the great interest of the gentleman from Connecticut in that item. I am glad to assure him that the sum recommended here is considered adequate to continue the work throughout the balance of the fiscal year.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Does that include the distribution and mailing of that marketing service which has meant so much to the fishing industry and to the fishermen generally?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am not familiar with all the details of the work. I understand, however, that provision is made for carrying on the normal work of the activity during the balance of the fiscal year.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is what I understood the Committee on Appropriations really did consider. I know and we all know in the New England area of the attention that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] has given to veterans' problems in that area, and that he is fully conversant with the underlying causes of complaints that have been made, particularly in respect to the closing up of contact offices out in the districts, which had exceptionally heavy case loads. That was the basis of my complaints and the complaints of many others of my colleagues in the Massachusetts area. It seemed to be the intention to load up the central office in Boston with personnel at the expense of the so-called contact offices out in the districts. Under the provisions of this bill with the \$3,000,000 appropriation, the Veterans' Administration will be permitted, where it is justified, to maintain contact offices that carry heavy case loads if they find it is in the interest of the veterans to do that.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes. We cannot, of course, run the Veterans' Administration from the floor of Congress. We have given General Gray the amount of money that he says he needs for all essential services, and he can apply the funds in the manner in which the gentleman suggests or in any other

way that he sees fit to meet the essential needs of the veterans throughout the country.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. So you are in full agreement with the statement of the gentleman from New York, Chairman TABER, of the Committee on Appropriations, that it is the intention where the services are essential in these contact offices out in the districts which are nearer to the veterans that consideration should be given to the maintenance of such offices under this appropriation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am, wherever those services are essential.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I note on page 6 of the committee report with reference to the Department of the Interior, Bonneville Power Administration, that an allowance of \$625,000 was made plus the contract authorization of \$1,475,000. Is that amount sufficient in the gentleman's opinion to permit the Bonneville Power Administration to carry forward its program for the generation and transmission of hydroelectric power which is so essential now in our war activities and preparation for war in view of the critical situation that confronts us?

Mr. TABER. Whatever the budget estimates were, they were allowed.

Mr. ANGELL. The budget estimate was \$725,000.

Mr. TABER. We carry that money for the purpose of going ahead and completing the power lines so that certain territory could be served.

Mr. ANGELL. In other words, so that the full utilization of the power to be generated at Grand Coulee will be made available?

Mr. TABER. I do not know about the full utilization, but that amount was carried so that certain territory could be served.

Mr. ANGELL. I mean full utilization of power presently being produced and to be made available in the near future.

I am glad the committee has made this essential appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], a member of the committee.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I think the Members of the House like to have the feeling at this critical time in the history of our world that we are providing adequate funds for the Atomic Energy Commission. Yesterday we authorized a tremendous program for relief to Europe hoping that we might help free nations to retain their freedom and join with us in preserving the peace and security of the world. Certainly while we are undertaking indirectly to help ourselves by helping others, we should undertake directly to help our own country become more secure. Unfortunately last year requests for the atomic program, that is the Budget estimates for the atomic program, were reduced. But the bill now before us provides \$150,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission. The members of the Commission explained in detail the need for the money and they indicated no desire for funds at this time except the \$150,000,000 pro-

vided in this bill in the form of a contract authorization. I might say that I feel the Congress has the right to feel that a real aggressive program is being carried out in the atomic military program.

The Members of the House have indicated considerable interest in the \$3,000,000 provided for the Veterans' Administration. This man, General Gray, the new Director of the Veterans' Administration, who appeared before the Deficiency Subcommittee for the first time insofar as I know, made a good impression; at any rate, he made a good impression upon me. He seems to be a man who deals forthrightly and fairly. He seems to have an alert mind and a broad background of experience, and I am hoping that he will be able to do a good job in administering this gigantic program over which he now has jurisdiction. He said that he needed the \$3,000,000, and this Congress is, of course, in this bill providing the \$3,000,000 which he requested, and he has wide latitude in the use of those funds in the employment of additional personnel. I reassert my own interest in seeing that the needs of the veterans of the Nation are adequately met.

The Voice of America program came in for a considerable reduction. The report will show that something over \$5,000,000 was requested but only a portion of that amount was provided by the committee. It is my sincere conviction that the Voice of America program up to date has not been very well administered, and I joined others on the subcommittee in some very pointed criticism of some of the work that has recently been done by the Voice of America program. We had access to some programs which have been broadcast which we thought were utterly ridiculous and could serve no useful purpose. It is only fair, however, to say that the Congress has provided the Information Service in the State Department with inadequate funds in the past—has denied the State Department the funds it has previously requested.

I regret to say that it is perfectly apparent that as propagandists our Government is not very expert; we are rank amateurs. But at a time when communism is threatening to engulf a large portion of the world and threatens the liberties of all free governments, it is certainly mandatory that we try to meet that challenge, and preserve our liberties. It is the duty and function of the Voice of America to help make known to the world the true attitude of our Nation and our desire for peace among all peoples. Personally, I would like to have seen the full request of the President for the Voice of America carried in this bill. Members will realize that when we are appropriating many billions for foreign relief and many billions for our own domestic national defense program that the few millions of dollars involved in the Voice of America program can easily be justified. We must do a bigger and better job if the best interests of the Nation are to be served.

The Geological Survey, which has the responsibility of making continuous and intensive studies of the underground and

surface waters of the Nation was denied by \$150,000 the amount of money requested. This, I think, was a mistake on the part of the committee, because there is hardly a county, city, or community in America that does not have a water problem of some kind, ground water or surface water problem, and I personally feel that the full amount of \$635,000 should have been approved rather than the \$450,000 which is provided for in the bill.

Some of the expenditures provided for in this bill do not contribute to the overall worth of the Nation. That cannot be said, however, of the budget request of \$175,000,000 for the REA that was slashed to only \$75,000,000 which, in my judgment, was a serious mistake. The full \$175,000,000 should have been provided in fairness to those who are interested in the REA program. It should be said that REA officials have said they cannot commit or spend the entire \$175,000,000 prior to July 1 of this year, but they can obligate a considerable portion of that amount and they can carry the remaining sums over into the next year, and in this year and next year we will have the most ambitious REA program which has ever been undertaken in the history of the Nation. Every time we build an REA line and bring electricity to a rural home we are enriching the Nation, increasing our productive capacity, and contributing to the health and happiness of the people. What is more, there is no out-of-pocket cost to the taxpayer. Rather it is a gain to the taxpayer.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. With applications now pending and the ones that will come in during the next fiscal year, they will exceed the entire amount of this \$175,000,000 plus the \$400,000,000 provided for next year. If the money is not spent, it will not be used and every dollar that is spent will come back with interest. So you do not even run a chance of losing a dollar by this appropriation.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct that these funds cannot be lost. There is no charge to the Treasury if the funds are not expended and at a time when our national commitments and obligations are so heavy there is every reason why we should improve our own productive capacity, our own workshop, so to speak, if we are to meet the unforeseen problems of the future.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I would like to get this REA matter straightened out in my own mind. I read in the Record in connection with previous appropriations for the REA that it asked the Budget last December for \$175,000,000, according to their own testimony given before your committee or some committee at a previous hearing. The Bureau of the Budget would not allow that request. Then a few days ago in the Agricultural appropriation bill the committee gave them \$100,000,000 more than they had requested.

Mr. MAHON. That was for the fiscal year 1949 which will begin July 1, making a total of \$400,000,000 for the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. VURSELL. In other words, they were given by this committee \$100,000,000 more than the administration was willing for them to have?

Mr. MAHON. Than the administration requested for the next fiscal year.

Mr. VURSELL. More than they would O. K. at that particular time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas five additional minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. There are \$75,000,000 written into this bill which makes up the \$175,000,000. Now you will have about \$475,000,000, as I understand it, for the coming year, is that right?

Mr. MAHON. Well, no. You will have for the coming year \$400,000,000 and according to this bill \$75,000,000 for the remainder of this year ending on June 30, 1948.

Mr. VURSELL. You will have \$475,000,000. Is it not a fact they have been able to extend REA as fast as they could get labor and material today?

Mr. MAHON. No; that is not the precise fact. These orders for REA equipment must be placed. They have got to compete with our domestic orders for materials and also with foreign demands. If the farmer does not get into the waiting line for these materials he never gets them. There is a period of waiting between the time these funds are obligated and they actually get the material. The hearings show very clearly that the materials are becoming much more accessible than they have heretofore been. The hearings show that the Congress appropriated for this fiscal year \$225,000,000. The REA has dribbled this money along throughout the fiscal year in order not to run short of funds, feeling they were acting under the mandate of Congress. They could have wisely expended or obligated all of this money. After all, this is but a loan which is later repaid the Treasury. The REA held back the program. It had to. They kept down the applications and they denied people the REA services which the people were seeking to get because they wanted to make this money last throughout the entire year. They could have obligated it much earlier.

Mr. VURSELL. I realize they could have obligated probably more money but it is still a debatable question whether they could have gotten the material and the labor. Taking into consideration this appropriation which will bring the backlog up to something like \$450,000,000 and taking into consideration that we are likely to have an increase in shortage of material by reason of the fact that we voted for the Marshall plan, the chances are in the coming 12 months you will not be able to get anywhere near the material for which you have the money on account of the shortage that is bound to follow by the shipping of steel, electrical equipment, and everything else that is going out of this country under the mandate of the Congress which yesterday passed the so-called Marshall plan.

Mr. MAHON. That is all the more reason why we should appropriate now the \$175,000,000 in order that the different REA cooperatives out through rural America may get these funds, may enter into contracts for the purchase of equipment so that their requests for equipment may have priority over others which may come from industry both in this country and elsewhere. So the passage of the Marshall plan is all the more reason why those who want to help the farmer get electricity should vote for this additional appropriation of \$175,000,000 for this program.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. In answer to the gentleman from Illinois, and his observations made a moment ago, let me say that about a month ago I was back in the district which I have the honor to represent and attended a meeting of a cooperative made up of three counties in my district, and I found these facts: There were 4,000 farmers who had applications in for REA—as many applicants that could not be served as there were users in that cooperative.

In other words, these men had had these applications on file for months waiting and waiting for this service, which every farmer is entitled to, and this \$175,000,000 will, as the gentleman says, permit the cooperatives to make contracts and allocations and make it possible for these farmers, after a 6- or 12-month wait, to get the service which they are entitled to. This is not an expenditure but a loan to solvent borrowers which will be repaid to the Government with interest. I do hope we adopt the proposed amendment and make life for the people on many of our farms a little brighter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. I will say to the gentleman that many people have made applications and made their deposits for REA service not only twelve months ago, but several years ago. By reason of the war and shortages of material they have waited a long, long time, and therefore I feel that Congress ought to embark upon a real program to take electricity to the farm homes of America, particularly since it does not cost the taxpayers any money. I am not going to pretend to economize by denying electricity to the farm homes of the Nation.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WORLEY. I would like to say to the gentleman that I agree with the views he expresses on the REA program. I intend to support the amendment that will be offered to increase the amount for REA. I understand such an amendment will be offered; will it not?

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

Mr. WORLEY. While REA is of great importance, another particularly important item during these troubled times is the amount appropriated for the Atomic

Energy Commission. Did the gentleman say that was increased by \$150,000,000?

Mr. MAHON. One hundred and fifty million dollars contract authorization, which will later be followed by an actual appropriation.

Mr. WORLEY. Then all the money that has been requested for that purpose has been provided for?

Mr. MAHON. All the money presently requested has been appropriated or provided for in contract authorization.

Mr. WORLEY. Can the gentleman assure the House that the atomic energy program is moving forward fast enough to meet any international emergency?

Mr. MAHON. It is my opinion based upon the information given our committee that the program is moving along in a satisfactory manner. Of course, the whole matter is desperately important to our security.

I thank the gentleman for his comments. I know of his interest in that program and his aggressive support of REA and atomic energy development.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman remember the original estimates set up for REA for the present fiscal year?

Mr. MAHON. I do not have the figure. We appropriated \$225,000,000 this year for the REA. What the budget estimate was, I do not recall. But, the budget estimate now before us is \$175,000,000, and this bill provides only \$75,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

THE FARMER—WHAT WE HAVE DONE FOR HIM AND WHAT MORE CAN BE DONE

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of the Budget has recommended that we appropriate \$175,000,000 in order to keep the REA program moving from now until July 1. I know something about that budget request from its inception.

I also know that from my State alone there are applications on file at REA for \$17,737,000 from people who want electricity and who are able to pay for it. I know the REA does not have enough money for the remainder of this fiscal year to take care of these people, and I know that every cent of the amount we will appropriate here today will be applied for before the fiscal year 1948 is over, and every cent of the \$400,000,000 that we appropriated in the regular agricultural appropriation bill for 1949 will be needed to take care of the requests that will normally arise after July 1.

The budget asked us for \$300,000,000 for 1949. We very wisely added \$100,000,000 to that. The budget request we are now considering asked for \$175,000,000 for use between now and July 1. You cut \$100,000,000 off that. In the final analysis, you have added exactly nothing to the President's estimate.

I urge that this \$100,000,000 be restored so that what we did for the rural people

2 weeks ago will not be canceled by what we do to them today.

KNEW BUDGET ESTIMATE FROM ITS INCEPTION

When REA began to slow up in approving loan applications from my people and yours, I took this matter up with Mr. Wickard. He said at that time that REA could use for the remainder of this year \$175,000,000 without receiving another application that was not already on file. I then went to the Secretary of Agriculture, who agreed to send over this budget estimate; and, after I talked with officials of the budget, the estimate did come over for this \$175,000,000. That is why I said earlier that I know something of this item from its inception.

I can well remember when the bill to authorize rural electrification was before this body. I handled it. I reported it from the committee. It passed the Senate. I passed it through the House. Good men, sensible men, men who wanted to help the farmers, got on this floor—and I reviewed the record the other day and read their speeches—and some said, "This money is all going to be wasted. These farmers will take electricity, and when the bill comes around they will take it out."

TEXAS FARMS HAVE KEPT ELECTRICITY

If there is one farm in the State of Texas that ever had rural electrification that has taken it out, I know nothing about it. Most of the cooperatives are ahead on their payments. We are lending this money to these farm cooperatives, and this money that is going out of the Treasury is coming back with interest. It is not an expense to the Government. It is actually an investment that shows a current profit.

In my State, to show you what has been done, in 1936 fewer than 3 percent of the farm homes were electrified. Those few homes were either just out of the city limits or they were the homes of rich men. Of course, we had practically a hiatus of construction during the war because you could not get copper wire and you could not get transformers and you could not get the poles. But even though practically nothing was done during the war years, today more than 53 percent of the farm homes in all of the State of Texas have the comforts and conveniences of rural electrification.

MUST HAVE ELECTRICITY AND ALL-WEATHER ROADS

I want to point out another thing. The young people of rural America are not going to stay on the farms and raise the food we need to eat and the fiber we need for our clothing unless they have two things. One is the comforts and conveniences of electricity and the other is all-weather roads. We might just as well face the music. If we are to develop this country so that we can feed ourselves and have some surplus left over to trade with the other countries of the world in exchange for their surplus products, we must have these two comforts and conveniences—these two necessities for our farm homes.

FARM BOY DOESN'T FORGET

A boy who is born and raised on the farm may forget many things as he grows older—he may forget what he learns in school, some of his business sense may

slip his mind—but he never forgets the farm.

Nobody knows better than I how true that is.

Through the years I have been privileged to serve as Representative of the Fourth District of Texas I have never forgotten that I am just a farm boy.

The teachings of the farm and the farmers' understanding of the wonders of the soil, the goodness of people, and the great power of prayer and humility—those things have been my guiding principles in all that I have done on down through life.

As I see the picture of the world today, America needs to turn back to the farm. If that could come to pass, I know this country would get closer to God. Many of the weeds in our thinking would be killed off if that happened. The roots of democracy do not grow deep in the slums of the big cities, through the mud of inadequate farm roads, or in the darkness of unelectrified homes.

Men of the soil brought this free land of ours into being, because as farmers, they understood what freedom means. Whenever our precious heritage is in peril, you can count on men of the soil being the first to defend it.

These things must be emphasized in order to point out just how important the farmer is. He is the cornerstone of our freedom in this country and in the world. Giving him the tools and assistance he needs to produce an ever-increasing supply of food is every bit as important as supplying guns and shells to our soldiers.

We must not make the farmer the scapegoat of political promisers by abolishing or throttling our farm programs. This is no time for that sort of foolish and false economy.

PROMISES DO NOT REPLACE RAIN

It is not my practice to engage in promising that I will do this or I will do that in Washington. I have followed that policy throughout my service in public office because promises do not replace rain; promises do not support the price of cotton; promises do not top farm-to-market roads, and promises do not turn on electricity in farm homes.

Let us examine just what the major problems of our farmers are. What are the basic farm problems in my district and all across the land?

The fundamental problem is conservation of the soil. After all, the soil is the farm. If the soil washes away or blows away or is worn out, the farm is useless. No activity of our Government is more important than soil conservation.

Soil may be wonderfully rich, prices may be high, but what does all this matter if there are no roads to get the farmer and his family into town and to the market?

COTTON FARMERS' MONEY DEPENDS ON CONDITIONS AROUND THE GLOBE

Finally, of course, there is the problem of markets abroad for the food our farmers produce. Sometimes the ports of Europe and Asia seem far removed from north Texas, but actually the money a Texas cotton farmer carries in his pocket may depend upon conditions halfway around the globe.

Now that is just a hasty review of the problems that are most important for the farmers of the country at present. What have we done, and what are we now doing to solve them?

FARMERS ARE AS POOR AS THE SOIL THEY LIVE ON

First, on soil conservation.

When I was growing up in the rich black land and fertile sandy loam country around home, soil conservation was practically unheard of. So the land was plowed up and down the slope; the timber was cut; the streams were undammed for many years, and the results were just as sure as rain.

Our rich treasure of topsoil began washing away from the fields, leaving gullies and ditches across the plowed ground, and making some areas unfit for use. If that had continued, my district—and a goodly portion of the entire United States—would today be covered with empty ghost towns.

But since I came to Congress, I have been privileged to work with many fine men in the House to secure steadily increasing appropriations for the work of soil conservation. It has been during the history of this work that the dust storms appeared and then were mastered by soil-conservation experts. Yes; and you see fewer pastures and fields gutted down to rock bottom with ditches now. I helped create the Soil Conservation Service. I voted for the first money to put it in operation. I have continued to vote for the funds needed to keep that work going.

FARMERS ARE DEPENDENT ON THE PRICE OF WHAT THEY GROW

Now, second, let us consider the matter of prices.

Congress and Members of this body cannot crook a finger and command prices to come up, but Congress has used its power to say that prices shall not drop below a certain point.

The farm price-support program is certainly one of the most sound and beneficial activities of the Government. The farmers, who take a big gamble every time they plant a crop, deserve this stabilizer—this minimum wage for farmers.

There is talk about cutting the price support for cotton to 52 percent of parity. That is the floor set for basic commodities by the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1938. Prior to the passage of this act our Government had never acknowledged any responsibility for the welfare of the farmer. It set a new standard of Government assistance to those who feed and clothe our people. I helped to develop that policy. I have helped to raise that floor, until today the price of cotton is supported at 92½ percent of parity, and the Government has not only helped our farmers but has made nearly a quarter of a billion dollars doing it. Other farm prices are also supported against disastrously low figures that would spell ruin to our farmers, then ruin to our whole economy. I do not propose to sit idly by and see it destroyed or weakened by those who never knew what it is to drag a cotton sack.

FARMERS SHOULD NOT BE FORCED TO LIVE ALONE

Farmers know that "no man liveth to himself alone." It makes no difference how far the farmer lives from the courthouse, from the railroad, from the bright lights, he and his family have the same desire to be able to see and visit these developments of civilization—and the same right—as those who live in cities. To do this the farmer must have roads—not highways, desirable as they are—but just plain roads over which he can travel every day in the year. If he does not have such roads, he is likely to move to town. If he does so, he becomes a competitor of those already there. Is it not better for the city dweller to help that farmer and that farmer's family stay on farms where they will be consumers of the products of industry and labor? Will not that farmer and his family be happier on the farm and be worth more to the country if he has a road which will enable them to participate in the civic life of the community and in the business life of the trade center?

Recently we passed a bill extending for 3 years more this highway program. In 1944 when postwar highway building legislation came before Congress, I told the Members that at least 30 percent of that money should be set aside for farm-to-market roads. The Members agreed, and now we can have nearly 1 mile of farm-to-market road built for every 2 miles of highways if the States will appropriate money to match the Federal funds. I expect to continue to ask for funds for these rural roads.

FARMERS DEPEND ON REA

Fourth, the rural electrification question—the question involved in this bill.

When I came to Washington as a Congressman, I could not have imagined what the current of electricity would do to the rural areas of this land—bring them to life, give them new prosperity and new hope, and add all the luxury of city life to rural areas.

I am very proud that I sponsored the legislation in Congress that started the rural-electrification program in this Nation.

It is now evident to every eye what electricity has done for the homes in rural areas all across the land. Now our rural areas can compete with the urban areas as never before. A great new era of wealth, comfort, and happiness has been made possible by electric current.

I am proud that the Fourth District of Texas has been among the leaders in expanding the lines of the REA cooperatives and making current available throughout the district. I know that each family with electricity enjoys a better life because of it.

FARMER'S INCOME RELATED TO WORLD TRADE

And, finally, we come to the question of how the world situation affects the farmer.

Some would have you believe that Texas farmers are not bothered about the matter of exports, but exports may make them or break any man in north Texas. I shall make a brief illustration of one case I have in mind.

PRICE OF COTTON KEPT HIGH

After World War II, the Department of Agriculture and the Army engaged in

a big program of disposal of millions of bales of surplus cotton abroad throughout the war-torn countries.

I went to see the Agriculture Secretary shortly before that was done and discussed it with him. I felt that getting rid of the surplus at once was the wisest thing to do and would mean much to the American cotton farmer.

The Secretary agreed and the order was issued. Those exports kept the price of cotton high and prevented a sudden and unfortunate drop right at the end of the war. If we are to maintain the markets for our cotton, we must maintain our exports. I am constantly fighting to maintain these conditions which are so vital to the sale of the products of Texas farms.

I have reviewed these actions, not with any desire for personal acclaim, but rather to point out the fight some of us have carried on for the farmers of the entire Nation.

In the legislative processes of the United States, miracles are not wrought overnight. We have only begun. Appropriating the \$175,000,000 today will be one step forward.

Promises are easy things to bestow and easy to give away. It has been my observation that promises do not get the job done alone—work and experience are necessary.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I was delighted to hear the remarks of the two distinguished gentlemen from Texas [Mr. MAHON and Mr. RAYBURN] supporting this additional appropriation of \$175,000,000 for rural electrification for the balance of this fiscal year.

I was surprised to hear my distinguished friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] raise the partisan issue, because, so far as I am concerned, and so far as the House is concerned, I have never observed any partisan fight on the rural electrification issue.

I remember in 1938 when I put through the amendment for the first \$100,000,000 for rural electrification, some men on the other side of the aisle, I can mention some of the names now: Mr. Treadway, of Massachusetts; Mr. Rich, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Knutson; Mr. Woodruff; Mr. Michener; Mr. Reed of New York, and others, joined me on the teller vote, and we only won by six majority.

That gave rural electrification a real start, doing more for the American farmers than anything else that Congress has ever attempted.

During most of the calendar year 1947 applications were received at the rate of \$24,000,000 a year. The record shows, however, that for the first 11 weeks of 1948 they were coming in at the rate of eight and one-third million dollars a week. If this rate continues during the remainder of the fiscal year 1948 and throughout 1949, we will have applications for \$850,000,000. We only have \$50,000,000 carried over. So it will take the full \$800,000,000—the \$400,000,000 provided for next year, the \$225,000,000 already appropriated for the present fiscal year, and the \$175,000,000 we are asking for in this amendment.

If the Senate approves the \$400,000,000 for the fiscal year 1949 which the House has passed, and if the budget's request for this \$175,000,000 supplemental for the remainder of the year is appropriated, as I said, the combined total will amount to \$800,000,000 for the expansion of this great rural electrification program. We will have, as I said, \$850,000,000 worth of applications at the present rate, and with the \$50,000,000 on hand, when that is expended, we will need \$800,000,000 for the balance of this year and for the next fiscal year.

I have broken down the applications now pending in the Rural Electrification Administration, and I call the attention of my distinguished friend from Illinois to the fact that there are applications pending from the State of Illinois for \$9,387,000; from the State of Kansas applications are pending amounting to \$13,523,000; from Iowa, \$13,781,000.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I wish to ask the gentleman from Mississippi what it costs for the administration of this act.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not have the exact figures here. Probably some of the other members of the committee can provide them.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I can well understand that there might be \$9,000,000 in the third or fourth largest State in the Union, but the point I want to bring out in fairness is that many of these obligations are 4 and 5 years old and could not be serviced because of lack of materials during the war. May I say this—that there is no one more interested in taking care of the people of Illinois than I am.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to assure the gentleman from Illinois that in this respect I am more than willing to help him. This is not a local issue with me at all.

There should be a mail box in front of every farmhouse in America, and I agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] that there should be an all-weather road to every farmhouse; but above all, there should be a power line to every farmhouse in America.

When I began this fight back in 1934, 90 percent of the farms of Germany were electrified, 90 percent of the farms of Japan were electrified, 94 percent of the farms of France and of Italy were electrified, 65 percent of the farms of New Zealand, a new and sparsely settled country, were electrified. In this country we had only 10.9 percent of our farms electrified. Today we have more than 60 percent of our farms in this country electrified. Let us make it 100 percent.

Let me remind you again that this money all comes back with interest. You are not giving these farmers anything. One reason they cannot get materials allotted is that they are not sure of the money with which to pay for them. This money will add billions of dollars to the wealth of this Nation, and, as I said, it will not cost this Government a dime. Every dollar of it will come back with interest.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. Would the gentleman care to make an observation as to where the washing machines, the radios, the milking machines, the electrical equipment that goes into these farm homes comes from?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly, they are manufactured in the territory of our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] and in New York and the Eastern States.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has mentioned the increase in value of our farms through being electrified. What would the gentleman say about the increased production on our farms when the farm is electrified?

Mr. RANKIN. It has been tremendous. It has taken to the farmer everything we have in the city except the noise and city taxes.

It has done more to raise the standard of living on the American farm than anything else that has ever been undertaken.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Is it not true that had the farms of America been electrified during the critical times through which we have gone, their productive capacity would have been far greater than what it was?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. And if in future years we could electrify the farms and see that they got the equipment they need it would add immeasurably to national defense.

Mr. RANKIN. Absolutely. I cannot understand why anybody would oppose this program. They talk about \$400,000,000 for next year. At the rate we are going I have shown you that we will have \$850,000,000 of applications. When the Bureau of the Budget realized this they added this \$175,000,000 to the \$225,000,000 already provided, which will bring this up to \$800,000,000, every dollar of which will be used legitimately in improving the conditions of farm life.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman about the soundness of the investment in this program. I can remember years ago when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] introduced the bill which brought about the REA program in the House and we Democrats from the city recognized the full impact favorably upon our national economy as well as the happiness it would bring to hundreds of thousands of our fine farmers and their families, increasing their production and benefiting our national economy, and we Democrats from the city have always supported it.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I have supported the development of all the water power in this country. When I came to Congress we were using 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. That was in 1921. Today we are using five and a half times that amount. We have 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power a

year now going to waste. I am in favor of developing all of it, and providing it to the American people at the lowest possible rate.

Here is a list of applications for loans by States. The 12 States which have in the largest total applications at this time are: Missouri, with \$30,437,000; North Dakota, \$22,490,000; Texas, \$17,739,500; Nebraska, \$18,579,000; Georgia, \$14,790,000; South Dakota, \$14,260,000; Iowa, \$13,781,000; Kansas, \$13,523,000; South Carolina, \$11,795,000; Minnesota, \$11,753,000; Kentucky, \$11,147,000; and Florida, \$10,250,000.

The complete list follows:

ALABAMA

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$5,752,000.

ARIZONA

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$1,076,000.

ARKANSAS

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$4,785,000.

CALIFORNIA

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$130,000.

COLORADO

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$5,698,000.

CONNECTICUT

The applications now pending from that State amount to zero.

DELAWARE

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$150,000.

FLORIDA

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$10,250,000.

GEORGIA

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$14,790,000.

IDAHO

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$1,310,000.

ILLINOIS

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$9,387,000.

INDIANA

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$2,130,000.

IOWA

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$13,781,000.

KANSAS

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$13,523,000.

KENTUCKY

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$11,147,000.

LOUISIANA

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$2,591,000.

MAINE

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$146,000.

MARYLAND

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$800,000.

MASSACHUSETTS

The applications now pending from that State amount to zero.

MICHIGAN

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$2,456,000.

MINNESOTA

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$11,753,000.

MISSISSIPPI

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$6,730,000.

MISSOURI

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$30,437,000.

MONTANA

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$8,462,000.

NEBRASKA

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$18,597,000.

NEVADA

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$80,000.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$3,469,000.

NEW JERSEY

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$140,000.

NEW MEXICO

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$1,510,000.

NEW YORK

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$127,000.

NORTH CAROLINA

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$4,112,000.

NORTH DAKOTA

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$22,490,000.

OHIO

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$3,276,000.

OKLAHOMA

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$9,407,000.

OREGON

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$1,740,000.

PENNSYLVANIA

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$2,170,000.

RHODE ISLAND

The applications now pending from that State amount to zero.

SOUTH CAROLINA

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$11,795,000.

SOUTH DAKOTA

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$14,260,000.

TENNESSEE

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$10,055,000.

TEXAS

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$17,739,500.

UTAH

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$590,000.

VERMONT

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$450,000.

VIRGINIA

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$4,485,000.

WASHINGTON

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$2,195,000.

WEST VIRGINIA

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$53,000.

WISCONSIN

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$6,059,000.

WYOMING

The applications now pending from that State amount to \$2,550,000.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to propound a question to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I notice on page 19, lines 3, 4, 5, and 6, of the bill an appropriation of \$143,000,000 for government and relief in occupied areas. It appears from the hearings that the request was for \$150,000,000 and in the committee report, page 9, it is stated that those in charge of the program advised the committee that a saving of \$7,000,000 can be had in civilian-employee pay and travel and so forth. The committee is therefore giving the War Department the full amount requested for relief in occupied areas?

Mr. TABER. For food; yes, sir.

Mr. PACE. Inasmuch as the committee has allowed the full amount requested, the Department will be expected to substantially follow the justification and the items set out in the hearings under this \$150,000,000?

Mr. TABER. That is my understanding.

Mr. PACE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I was gratified and relieved at the assurances given by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] that the \$3,000,000 contained in this deficiency bill would enable the Veterans' Administration to restore the essential services that have been recently curtailed, and I desire to express my appreciation to the committee for their willingness to provide these funds.

I represent a State that has no veterans hospital within its borders, and a district that has had three contact offices closed within the last few weeks. Nashua, the second largest city in the State; Concord, the State capitol; and Claremont; all in my district, have lost their offices.

I met with other members of the New England delegation on March 8 to consider this serious situation and on March 11 was one of a committee which interviewed the President of the United States, urging him to remove the restrictions which prevented the sending up a request to the Committee on Appropriations.

I have conferred with the Veterans' Administration within the last 24 hours and have been informed that this deficiency appropriation will permit the restoration of all essential services. I have every confidence, therefore, that the situation in my district, as well as the districts of other members here who have suffered the most heavily, will be taken care of immediately, and I take this opportunity to express my appreciation of the attitude of the Administrator in regard to this matter.

I am positive that we are all in accord on one thing, and that is that whatever our decision may be as to what can be done for our veterans who enjoy physical health, there is one place in which we will not economize and that is in the prompt service and efficient care of the injured and disabled veterans. I shall continue to press this point in behalf of those whom I represent.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee a question. He will recall that earlier in the year on an appropriation bill the chairman handled I presented a limitation amendment in connection with proposed conversions to oil from coal or new installations of oil-burning equipment in the appropriation bill then pending. The chairman and the committee were good enough to accept it at that time.

Subsequently, it seemed to me it would be more advisable to take the matter up with each subcommittee and inquire during debate if it was the intention of the committee that no part of the appropriation shall be used for those purposes unless it can be clearly demonstrated that it is absolutely essential. I have asked this question of the chairman informally. I understand that is the purpose and intention of the committee handling this particular appropriation bill. Am I right?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to request that the Appropriations Committee and this body give further consideration to the \$700,000 item which was eliminated from the Bureau of the Budget's request for maintenance and operation of schools. I refer specifically to page 6 of this bill, lines 16-24. You will note that the committee has recommended for the Federal Works Agency, Bureau of Community Facilities, an additional amount for maintenance and operation of schools to the extent of \$1,300,000. The request of the Bureau of the Budget for this purpose was for \$2,000,000. At this point I would like to call your attention to page 3 of the committee's report. It states, in discussing this action regarding the Federal Works Agency, that the committee believes expenditures should be limited to deficits incurred during the current year rather than reimbursements for deficits incurred for prior years. The committee

accordingly eliminated \$700,000, which supposedly was the amount earmarked for meeting 1946-47 school deficits. I would like to point out, however, that the Federal Works Agency requested only \$669,181 to reduce the 1946-47 school deficits. In cutting the request by \$700,000, then, the committee has actually eliminated \$30,819 needed to meet 1947-48 school deficits. The Congress should, therefore, consider restoring this \$30,819 if we are to meet the anticipated 1947-48 deficits. In fact, I might add that the deficits originally anticipated for 1947-48 have been exceeded because of the severe winter in sections of the country where the schools concerned are located.

I also wish to briefly call the attention of the Members of the House to the importance of meeting these 1946-47 deficits. It was the intent and purpose of the Lanham Act and the Landis Act which succeeded it to meet the deficits incurred by the schools which qualified for assistance under these measures. The fact that sufficient appropriations were not available in 1946-47 to make it possible for these schools to enter the 1947-48 year free of deficit is not the fault of the schools involved. These deficits are not just figures for academic discussion, they are actual bills which must be met. During the hearings of the committee some question was raised as to the legality of appropriating funds this year to meet the deficits of 1946-47. That matter was adequately settled by Mr. Frank L. Yates, Acting Comptroller General of the United States. Mr. Yates, in a letter to the Federal Works Agency, stated that to meet the 1946-47 deficits with funds appropriated this year was not prohibited by Public Law 317 and, as far as his office is concerned, no objection thereto would ever be interposed. To illustrate how real this problem is, I would like to cite you specific cases which exist in my own congressional district. Of the nine school districts eligible for Landis Act funds, six have sizable deficits carried over from 1946-47. These are as follows:

School district:	1946-47 deficit
Kent Meridian School District, No. 222.....	\$2,080.24
Kent School District, No. 413.....	14,526.00
Redondo Federal Way School District, No. 210.....	11,970.00
Auburn School District, No. 408.....	41,404.00
Bellevue Overlake School District, No. 405.....	16,000.00
Clover Park School District, No. 400.....	4,462.09
Total.....	90,442.33

So you see, gentlemen, in one congressional district alone there is a 1946-47 school deficit totaling \$90,442.33 which must be met.

I sincerely hope, therefore, that in the final action this Congress will appropriate sufficient funds to meet the 1946-47 school deficits and provide the amount in 1947-48 to meet the needs of the schools which are eligible. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I shall move that we amend line 21, page 6, of this bill to strike out the figure \$1,300,000 and insert the figure \$2,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF].

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my appreciation to the Appropriation Committee for its action on the reclamation items in this bill and for the friendly attitude that has been shown by our Appropriation Committee toward reclamation. I think it is clear refutation of the false and partisan charges so often made that the Republican leadership is unfriendly to reclamation in our Western States. I particularly commend the fairness and discriminating judgment manifested by the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], of the Interior Subcommittee.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

FIGHT AGAINST AGRICULTURAL CREDIT ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, although we have three times as much available money and credit as we ever had before in history, interest rates continue to go up. The law of supply and demand is evidently not working in this field. I am a strong believer in a sound and adequate banking system. For that reason I have always supported the private banking system by helping to pass laws that would encourage and protect the private banking system. The agricultural credit system is also a part of our private enterprise system and should be encouraged and protected. Congress has been too good to the private banking system for this system to now take advantage of its strength and power to try to destroy our agricultural credit system. Congress provided the money to set up the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Congress made it a violation of the law for more than a very small amount to be paid by banks on time deposits—this was one of the earlier price control acts which remains in effect—Congress, in order to help the banks, made it a violation of the law for interest to be paid by a bank on demand deposits—these two provisions represent a net savings to banks of more than \$500,000,000 annually compared with prewar years. I am not complaining but I am bringing these points up to remind the banks that they have been helped substantially by Congress and they should not complain if Congress extends some help in the form of credit to farm credit associations. Many other privileges and benefits to banks extended by Congress could be enumerated and if the banks continue to fight the farmers organizations it might become material to disclose them. It is my sincere hope that the banks will cease their fight against the farmers credit organizations.

The following letter by an able, public-spirited citizen of Texas, along this line is self-explanatory:

Mr. V. S. MARETT,
Chairman, Agricultural Committee,
Texas Bankers Association,
Gonzales State Bank,
Gonzales, Tex.

DEAR MR. MARETT: The conditions of our country are such that I am unable to treat

lightly the letter of September 17 which you sent me asking, as chairman of the Texas Bankers' Association, for suggestions to be considered by your committee, in deciding upon its agricultural program.

In my letter last week suggesting that you propound like requests for suggestions to the Council of Economic Advisers to the President, to the Committee for Economic Development, and to the Department of Agriculture and proffer cooperation in problems pertaining to agriculture, it was my thought that such request and proffer from such source would serve to increase the interest of these groups in the problems of agriculture, as well as get suggestions from sources at the top in national economics.

To do a worth-while job will require expense. Make a worth-while program and get it and a budget of the needed expense approved by the president of the association. Submit both to member banks with requests for contributions to expense. The amount properly prorated will require small contributions of the several banks.

The two items I consider of prime importance in agriculture are soil and credit. These are of equal importance to our entire Nation. Both rural and urban people must be made aware of and kept impressed with the importance of soil conservation to them and to the entire Nation, until all become concerned. When all become concerned, that which should be done will be done. The conditions and importance of soil are told in the pamphlet *Our Native Land, a Trust to Keep*, and the newspaper clipping, *How Strong Is America*, which are enclosed herewith. I need not dwell upon the importance of soil. No country can out last its soil.

As to credit: Production of food, clothing, shelter, and everything that people use has to be produced. Credit is required in production. The larger production, the larger amount of credit. It was this Nation's credit and production that won the last war and with them, we are endeavoring to win the peace.

Production and credit require and demand a market for their products. When demand drops, production stops, and credit is left to stand and carry on or crash.

The booms and depression of recent years have taught us the need for strong and stronger credit. The depression of 1914-15 gave us the Federal Land Bank Act. The Federal Intermediate Credit Banks followed the postwar depression of 1921-22. The Coolidge prosperity largely increased credit. Demand for production began dropping in 1929. By 1933, 14,820 State and national banks with \$8,484,101,000 of deposits failed. Strong as was the Federal Reserve System, the burden was too much. The credit structure of the Nation had to be strengthened. The Congress provided the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and added to the cooperative agricultural credit structure the banks for cooperatives, the production credit corporations and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation came to the assistance of banks with over \$3,000,000,000 of loans to them and/or investments in their capital structure.

The land banks, intermediate credit banks, banks for cooperatives, the production credit associations, with the aid of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, shared with banks so strengthened and other lending concerns the debt burden of agriculture and all were strained to capacity.

There never was a time when our country had so great a need for strong and stronger credit institutions than the present. We must carry on. We must not crash. Both abundant credit and courage are required. Our Nation's welfare, the welfare of all Europe and the very preservation of civilization are largely dependent upon the credit strength of our Government and that of our credit institutions.

Such being the case, I am shocked and puzzled that the American Bankers' Association permits the Agricultural Commission of their association to be, at this time, endeavoring to destroy our cooperative farm credit system, which has done so much for agriculture and has been of value and convenience to commercial banks of farming sections of our country, when farmers have been unable to pay from farm income. See pages 4, 5, and 6 of Remarks by Governor of Farm Credit Administration, enclosed:

The annual cash income from Texas farms from 1928 to 1932, fell from \$867,436,000 to \$284,783,000—a fall of over 300 percent. Some further figures on Texas farm annual cash income: 1935—\$400,542,000; 1939—\$434,100,000; 1943—\$1,067,269,000; 1944—\$1,154,777,000. These changing conditions are not due to production but to prices that are not of the farmers' making.

What will happen if and when production shall exceed demand? Who, under the conditions now prevailing, would destroy or weaken any of our credit institutions, is more than shortsighted. He is blind as Sampson and bereft of reason.

The agricultural committee of the Texas Bankers' Association can do no greater service to agriculture, to Texas bankers and to the Nation than to acquaint itself of the advantage of cooperative credit and of cooperation in general in agriculture and become a factor in promoting it. I will mention a few items of advantage:

1. Cooperative agricultural credit possesses the strength of a government supervised and carefully directed group of thousands of farmers, as against the credit strength of an individual farmer.

2. Cooperative agricultural credit makes loans only for the purchase of land, improvements on land to be used for production and for production. The use of that credit is not inflationary as are loans for the purchase of consumer goods, now alarming the executives of the Federal Reserve Bank System.

3. The country needs the family-size farmer and farm family. Production that employs urban labor, needs the market farm families' buying power affords. For this market to serve to best advantage, these families should stop decreasing and must, in the future, have more stable income than in the past. Only by cooperation can that be attained.

4. The discovery is being made that the individual farmer cannot compete with large capital concerns, engaged in farm production of crops, with full supply of mechanized power and other machinery.

5. Collective action, by means of the corporation, has surpassed and supplanted the individual in all classes of industry except farming—proving the advantages and strength of collective action over the individual.

6. The rural community needs the collective advantages of cooperation, just as towns and villages need the collective advantages of the corporation.

7. Cooperation will strengthen and advance the industry of agriculture in the same manner the corporation has advanced other industries.

8. Finally, if we are to preserve our Government and the American way of life, we must keep the liberty-loving, independent, self-sufficient farmer and farm family, who Herbert Quick said "Are the ballast of our ship of State." Our form of government needs the stabilizing influence of our rural vote. Production needs the strength and certainty of cooperation. In cooperation, there are no strikes and no lockouts. There is no fight between labor and capital. Dr. Charles Eliot, president emeritus of Harvard, said "Cooperation affords an admirable example of collective action which does not diminish individual initiative and liberty, or

hinder the development of the individualistic virtues."

The soil conservation pamphlet and memorandum pocket book I am sending you would be a suitable and appreciated gift by banks to their farmer clientele. They can be had, without limit, for the asking.

Yours sincerely,

S. A. LINDSEY.

HIGH INTEREST

December 11, 1947, I made the following statements concerning higher interest:

There seems to be a deliberate attempt in this country, by powerful people, to greatly increase interest rates. The Government is now paying \$5,000,000,000 a year interest on the national debt at the rate of 2.01 percent interest. Most of our house loans are 4 percent. A \$10,000 home now can be purchased on long terms at a low rate of interest. Before 1933 such a home, as now sells for \$10,000, would have been available for \$4,500, but not as well constructed; and the purchaser of such a home then, on time, would have had 2 or 3 mortgages with refinancing problems practically every year and high interest rates, commissions, and fees to be paid. As high as the house is now, the purchaser, under Government standards, will not spend any more for the \$10,000 house in the end than he would have spent in the end prior to 1933 for the \$4,500 house. This illustration is not given to justify the high prices of homes today, but to indicate the disastrous effects of high interest rates. The result would likely be a stoppage of housing construction. If interest rates are increased, that means higher taxes in every city, county, and State in the Nation. It also means a higher cost of doing business for utilities that serve a city, which will result in higher rates to the utilities. Higher taxes and higher utility and transportation rates will mean higher wages and higher prices, both of which add to the spiral of inflation. Secretary of the Treasury Snyder is resisting this move to substantially increase long-term interest rates but the proposal is being pushed by very strong and influential people.

TIGHTER CREDIT

February 19, 1948, I made the following statement concerning higher interest rates:

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Government-owned, has been the means of keeping interest rates down the past 15 years; however, last session of Congress, the RFC was hog-tied and does not have the power to keep interest rates down that it formerly had. The lending institutions are taking advantage of this and are demanding higher and higher interest rates. This can lead to considerable trouble. The credit needs of business are very large and any increase in interest rates will be reflected in higher prices to the consumers. If the electric light, gas, water, railroads, and other utilities are compelled to pay higher interest rates, they will be seeking higher rates from the consumers, which will lead to higher taxes from the city to the Federal Government level. During the war, the average annual rate of interest paid by the Government on Government bonds was less than 2 percent; on account of tightening our interest rates the last few weeks, the average on the national debt has already increased substantially above 2 percent. Higher interest rates are already slowing housing construction.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, the House Appropriations Committee and its able chairman [Mr. TABER] are entitled to the

greatest praise by every Member of this House for the outstandingly excellent job being done in cutting Government spending.

We must cut spending if we are to enjoy tax reduction. By cutting the spending this committee is making tax reduction possible and when we get tax reduction the workers get what amounts to more carry-home pay.

Tax reduction means that every citizen gets more money every pay day to take home to spend on his family rather than giving it to the Government for the politicians to spend for him.

In one respect, however, I believe this bill has gone too far in cutting costs. The item I refer to is the reduction to \$1,300,000 of the \$2,000,000 asked by the Federal Public Works Agency for the relief of school districts in war-swollen communities.

In one city of my district, Vancouver, Wash., the population increased from 20,000 to more than 60,000 in 3 years, largely as the result of war shipyards and war aluminum plants moving into that city.

Most of the new population moved into war housing from which the local community received no taxes. Yet the children of these newcomers—and the number of those children was great—had to be educated and the citizens of Vancouver, believing that the success of democracy depends on education, did educate those children.

The cost of this was exceedingly heavy on the school district of Vancouver. The Federal Government has shared some of that cost, but not all by any means. As a result of this heavy cost, the Vancouver school district no longer is in as good financial condition as it should be.

The Federal Works Agency which has surveyed the conditions believe that the full \$2,000,000 is required to reimburse Vancouver and some 100 other similarly situated cities, and communities which suffer from war-swollen populations for the financial sacrifices the citizens of these cities and districts have made.

I hope that the full \$2,000,000 originally proposed for this item will be restored in the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the committee has acted on three propositions in this proposal, and I wish to congratulate them for their good sense and statesmanship. I refer specifically to the subject matter of the Bonneville Power Administration on page 6 of the report, Mount Edgecumbe Sanatorium, Sitka, Alaska, page 7 of the report; and particularly Turnagain Arm Road in Alaska, which is covered on page 8 of the report.

Yesterday afternoon this body overwhelmingly approved the plan for European relief, which plan I voted against, and I am now satisfied that we are on the way to plenty of trouble in the years to come, and insofar as I am personally concerned, I propose to support appropriations and other proposals to build the defense of this country, to the end that we may meet the military obliga-

tions which were voted by the Congress in this European relief program.

I think Alaska is one of our strategic areas of defense, and I look upon Alaska as the buffer state between Russia and the United States, and now I look upon the United States as the buffer state between Russia and the balance of the world. I consider power production and distribution in this country as essential as bread and butter and meat; and I consider the protection of the people of Alaska as important as the protection of the people in our States, and apparently the committee is moving in this direction.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The highest tide in America, with probably one exception, is at Turnagain Arm Road, Cook's Inlet, Alaska, it being 48 feet. I requested the Army engineers to make a survey of the possibility of developing hydroelectric power from that tide at that place.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am in favor of developing hydroelectric power in Alaska, and I am in favor of making Alaska a State of the Union and paving the way for a million new settlers to go into that territory. We need them in that area, and we need them as quickly as we can get them there.

Mr. RANKIN. There is enough potential power in Alaska, I will say to the gentleman, if it were developed, to run a dozen States, almost.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That may be true. I have no patience at all with the argument to the effect that the Alaskan people cannot afford to pay for the State government which the Alaskan people will impose upon themselves. I have no patience with the argument to the effect that the people of the United States are able to do these other things in the world and yet we are unable to finance a new statehood in Hawaii or finance a new statehood in Alaska. So I think we had better drop that argument that some people have been using in recent months. Continuing with this matter of defense which the Committee on Appropriations has approved here on these three items, plus others which are mentioned in this bill; I am in full accord with it, and I congratulate the committee. So far as I am concerned, I am ready to vote for the reenactment of selective service just as quickly as the proper committee can bring it before this body. We might as well get into the harness and take up the financial obligation we have now assumed under the proposition voted upon here yesterday afternoon. I am not in favor of proceeding at this time with universal military training, and at the present time I do not propose to support it. But I do want my people to understand that although I voted against that bill yesterday afternoon, I voted my convictions on it. I still think it is an unsound course for us to have adopted. However, it is now the policy of this country, and I have serious doubts now whether this Congress should further support the reduction in taxes, because there is very little sense in our voting tax reductions

and then voting as we did yesterday afternoon. I shall not be at all disappointed if the President's veto of the tax bill is not overridden, because it will simply be a piecemeal affair; for next year we will need between \$45,000,000,000 and \$55,000,000,000 or more in the Budget on today's price levels. At the same time, I am not going to raise any bitter argument about giving the people a little grass for the current calendar year in the way of a tax reduction. But as we give it to them, we had better say to them that we will increase taxes next year or we will go into deficit financing. I do not propose to support deficit financing where the national income is running at the rate of \$225,000,000,000 to \$250,000,000,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction of buildings: In addition to the appropriation of \$1,377,920 contained in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947, for the construction of an engineering building and women's dormitory units on the grounds of Howard University, the Public Buildings Administration is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of said appropriation in an amount not to exceed \$1,706,000: *Provided*, That no contract shall be entered into for such purposes which will result in a total cost to the Federal Government for completion of such buildings in excess of \$1,788,000 for the engineering building and \$1,378,000 for the women's dormitory units: *Provided further*, That the limitations on contract authority and total cost may be exceeded or shall be reduced by an amount equal to the percentage increase or decrease, if any, in construction costs generally dating from January 1, 1948, as determined by the Federal Works Administrator: *Provided further*, That transfers of funds may be made to the Public Buildings Administration, Federal Works Agency, of amounts appropriated for construction of these buildings.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 6, after line 7, insert the following:

"OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION"

"Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico): For an additional amount for payments to States in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4), \$2,000,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, in my honest opinion, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is one of the best agencies of the Government I have ever run across. They have appealed to the Deficiency Committee this year for \$2,000,000, and that has been stricken from the bill you have before you this afternoon.

I noticed in reading the report of the committee that they have denied this \$2,000,000 for additional grants to States on the basis that they claim that the tes-

timony discloses that these programs are successful in only 38 percent of the cases. They go further to say that on this basis it seems fair to say that expenditures in 62 percent of the cases are wasted because they fail to result in placing the individuals involved on an employable basis. This is a misleading statement.

When I read this statement this afternoon, having only finished with the testimony of this agency 3 or 4 weeks ago before the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security Appropriations, I checked into the figures we received in the hearings held by our committee, and I find that this statement is completely misleading. Apparently the Deficiency Committee, in considering these percentages, took into consideration that there were 112,000 applicants for vocational rehabilitation and only 43,800 were actually rehabilitated. The truth of the matter is that, out of the 112,000 applications for rehabilitation, 46,000 were thrown out on the basis of the application and the individuals would receive no help whatever. An additional 20,000 were thrown out after they had applied. Therefore the actual figures are that 46,000 applicants were taken into the program and 43,800 were rehabilitated and are employed today, which on a percentage basis means that 94.3 percent are now employed. That is a pretty good record for a Government agency to establish on the applicants they work with. Mind you, on the basis of the economy of our country, those 44,000 persons who were rehabilitated in 1947 have an earning capacity now of \$70,000,000. They are turning in to the Federal Government in taxes \$5,600,000. As a result, for every dollar that we appropriate for this program the Federal Government gets in return \$10. It is not only beneficial to the Government, it is beneficial to every community in this country. It is beneficial to every State in the country.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. Is it not true that the States have appropriated as much money as they expected the Federal Government would match with Federal funds, and that the programs have been started to rehabilitate disabled persons? Those programs will be curtailed and the money then will be wasted that has already been put into the program.

Mr. FOGARTY. You are absolutely right. If these \$2,000,000 are refused it means that the number of applicants they had hoped to rehabilitate in the year 1948 cannot be rehabilitated. They must say to 2,000 or 3,000 people who have been promised these services and this help by the Federal Government that the Congress refuses to appropriate the necessary amount to rehabilitate them in the year 1948. They will be told, "You will just have to wait your turn." Read the hearings before the deficiency committee. There was no justification, in my opinion, to leave out this \$2,000,000. That is one of the best agencies in the country today. It is doing most good for those who do not have a chance to get by. It gives to every person who is of employable age and who can be rehabilitated a chance to hold his head

high in the society of his own community and not be a ward of that particular community. Of these additional funds that are asked for, there is nothing that goes for additional personnel. What they are trying to do is to get \$2,000,000 to bring their program for the year 1948 up to date mainly because of the rise in the cost of living and the rise in the cost of services which are necessary to take care of these poor, unfortunate people.

The only money out of these \$2,000,000 which will go for anything else is \$75,000 for audit adjustments. I think any sound governmental agency wants to make sure that their agency is in a sound fiscal position and so that they know where every dime is being spent.

This agency asked for \$3,500,000 more than we allowed them for the fiscal year 1949. I offered an amendment at that time to raise the amount from eighteen million dollars to twenty-one-million-four-hundred-thousand-and-some-odd dollars. I gave as my reasons that the economic value to our Government was great as was the humane value to the person who was being rehabilitated. My distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], admitted that it was a great program. But the only thing that he had to offer that day was, "We must stop somewhere." Now I realize also that these things cannot keep going on and on pyramiding year after year, but we are responsible for this money that they are asking for now. We passed the original law. This law has been in effect since 1920. Five years ago the Congress liberalized the law. We placed no limitations then on the amounts that could be expended. If we want to do this in the right way and place a limitation on the amounts to be appropriated by this Congress or future Congresses, we should put a limitation in as to the number of people who can be rehabilitated year after year. In that program which they have for 1949, if they receive the \$3,500,000 additional, they could by their own figures rehabilitate 64,000 people in the next fiscal year who will have an earning capacity of \$100,000,000. They would pay in Federal taxes about \$9,000,000 to say nothing of State and local taxes, not taking into consideration the relief load which would be lifted from the local communities and the States and our Federal Government as well.

Mr. Chairman, if there was ever a more worth-while project in our Government; one so necessary in the functions of those who are not able, through no fault of their own, to earn a living for themselves, I have never heard of it. It is a responsibility we owe to those unfortunate people. There is something that can be done about it. We can get them back on their feet. It is a worth-while program and I sincerely hope that this House this afternoon will grant this \$2,000,000 additional that this Agency needs for the fiscal year 1948.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in behalf of this amendment. Like the previous speaker, I, too, am deeply interested in this program, but from a different angle. I am interested in the trainees, the prospective trainees, who would like to retrain in order that they might become self-supporting and not be a liability upon the Government any longer.

There are two justifications, I think, for the restoration of this \$2,000,000 requested in the original budget. In the first place, the \$2,000,000 represents just about the percentage of the budget that our cost-of-living percentage has risen over the past year. In addition to that the war industries during the war period were a great hazard to those people who were engaged in the industry. A great many people, because of accidents, had to retrain in order that they may become self-supporting.

I would like to give you a little incident in my experience as executive officer of that program in New Mexico. During part of the year 1944 and the fiscal year ending July 1, 1945, we had trained 79 people who were really ready for entering employment again. The first year's check on their salaries, their earnings, amounted to something over \$100,000 for those 79 workers who were retrained under the program. Their withholding taxes or income taxes amounted to more than half of the year's Federal money received by the State for the support of the program. If those 79 people could do that in 1 year it would not take very long to pay back their debt to the Government for their training. I cannot think of any program that the Government sponsors that does as much good as vocational rehabilitation. It is true that the program is not so well known, but it is not well known for one special reason. The instructors and the supervisors and the workers in this program go quietly about their work, because it is the desire of the leadership to protect the unfortunate people who need the training. If too much publicity were given to the work and to the opportunities offered, it might result in a hesitancy on the part of some people to retrain, and I think it is very wise that they do protect the trainees. I would like to urge that every Member reconsider and help to restore this very much needed \$2,000,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUSK. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I would just like to get these percentages straightened out. The statement in the report is completely misleading that only 38 percent of the program has been successful. They had 111,000 cases in 1947. They screened out 45,000 before they gave them any service at all. They screened out an additional 20,000 after they had been talked to, which left a net sum of 46,000 persons who were in the program, and out of 46,500, 43,800 were rehabilitated in 1947, which is an average of 94.3 percent successful.

Mrs. LUSK. I am glad to answer the gentleman from Rhode Island that in our case more than 90 percent of the

trainees are successful when they reenter employment. We have in New Mexico a health situation. A great many people come there for health purposes, and when they are able to work again they must learn to do something that will not be too much of a hazard upon their health after they have recovered from tuberculosis or other respiratory troubles. Those people have to be given some opportunity to learn a new work. This is the only program that provides that opportunity. Too many of the prospective trainees have no money for education after they have undergone medical care and health resoration.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. KEEFE] if this \$2,000,000 is not appropriated will it curtail the services to disabled persons that have already been started?

Mr. KEEFE. My understanding is that it will curtail the number of those that come into the program.

Mr. POTTER. In other words, a trainee who has already started and is in the middle of his training will not be dropped because of lack of funds?

Mr. KEEFE. That is my understanding of it. It will simply curtail the number that they take in month after month, that is all. I read the record, and I hope the gentleman heard the questions and the answers that I directed to Mr. Shortly, the director.

Mr. POTTER. I was not certain about that and I wanted it cleared up.

Mr. KEEFE. That is my understanding of it. In other words, they have certain people who are eligible for the program and they bring them in from month to month as they dig them out of the population. It simply means that a reduced number will have the availability of the program to the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. POTTER. On page 3 of the report it is stated that only 38 percent of the cases have been successful. What is the basis for that?

Mr. KEEFE. I did not write that report, as the gentleman well knows. While I am a member of the committee, it is not my report. The basis for it was the language of the gentlemen who testified before the Deficiency Committee. It is found on page 431 of the hearings. I read the questions and the answers from the hearings, and there it is:

About what percentage are you able to make a go of?

Mr. BURNS. That is running about 38 percent of cases closed.

That is plain English to me.

Mr. POTTER. That seems to coincide with what the gentleman on the other side said, that that includes the

cases that came in and applied and were automatically closed without service being rendered, because they were not eligible, possibly, for the training.

I am not exactly a novice in the field of vocational rehabilitation. I think it is very essential that we salvage as many broken bodies as possible. In fact, I much prefer to vote for an amendment that will provide \$2,000,000, which will be matched by the States, thus having a \$4,000,000 training program for disabled civilians, so that those people will become tax producers and not tax consumers.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. Boyle C. Scurlock, director of vocational rehabilitation division, State Department of Vocational Education of the State of Oklahoma, dated March 19, 1948, in which Mr. Scurlock said to me:

It is gratifying to know that you, as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling the appropriations for vocational education and rehabilitation, are alert to some of the dangers to these programs, and are conscious of the need for good State-Federal relations in programs such as these, where both State and Federal funds are involved.

The arguments which have been made in behalf of this amendment are not tenable. The arguments against it are fully supported by the record, as reflected in the printed hearings. The amendment should be voted down.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, so that the Members may have the exact picture on this and may know what it is, there was enough appropriated for this current year so that there were allotments made for four quarters of \$4,500,000 for each quarter. There is remaining \$4,500,000 to carry it through the balance of the fiscal year, to the first of July. If we add \$2,000,000 to this, it raises the total for the quarter to \$6,500,000. There is no State contribution with reference to this item. Four times six and a half million would be setting this agency up on a \$26,000,000 basis for a year. We have just passed a bill providing \$18,000,000 for next year, after the House had thoroughly considered the matter.

So that there may be no misunderstanding about the number of people involved, this question was asked, and I read from page 430 of the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. How many people are involved in this set-up? How many beneficiaries are there in this set-up through the year?

Mr. BURNS. About 170,000. They are the persons who are receiving rehabilitation services during the course of the year.

The CHAIRMAN. How long is the average period of rehabilitation?

Mr. BURNS. That has been running just around 1 year. Out of that group, we expect 53,000 or 54,000 to come out who are rehabilitated—that is, successfully rehabilitated.

The CHAIRMAN. You expect 54,000 to be rehabilitated—

Mr. BURNS. During this year.

The CHAIRMAN. And the others will not be; is that it?

Mr. BURNS. The most of them will not be.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. Does that not mean that they will not be rehabilitated and their training will have to be given up and will have to go over until next year?

Mr. TABER. I do not know. He says not during this year, but some of them would be rehabilitated in the opening months of next year.

There are 170,000 beneficiaries; 54,000 would come out. Then I asked them about what percentage they were able to make a go of, and Mr. Burns said, as appears on page 431 of the hearings, "That is running about 38 percent of the cases closed."

I am friendly toward this program, but it does seem to me that we have been very liberal in providing aid when we can take care of as many cases as we are taking care of. We should not go ahead and add more than 50 percent to the cost of this thing at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 48, noes 79.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance and operation of schools: For an additional amount for "Maintenance and operation of schools," \$1,300,000; and the limitation under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, on the amount available for administrative expenses, is increased from "\$50,000" to "\$70,000."

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TOLLEFSON: On page 6, line 21, strike out the figure "\$1,300,000" and insert the figure "\$2,000,000."

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, may I say at the outset that I dislike very much to offer an amendment which proposes to increase an item to which I am sure the Committee on Appropriations has given studious consideration.

I note in reading the hearings that considerable testimony was taken on this point, and I know that the committee has discussed this item considerably. However, I would be derelict in my obligation as I see it toward the people in my area if I did not seek to increase this item from the amount that is in the bill, namely \$1,300,000 to the amount that was requested by the Federal Works Agency, namely, \$2,000,000. This item does not apply to the majority of the Members of the House. It applies only to those gentlemen who come from areas where the population was increased because of war industry activity. To cite just a simple example so that those of you who do not live in those areas will understand the problem, I will refer to one of the seven school districts that

exist in my area. In the town of Renton, the population prior to the war was approximately 5,000. During the war that population increased to 15,000. In other words, the population tripled. It is easy to understand the increase in the educational facility requirements which were necessary. The school district in which Renton is situated, and the services which were required for the school children who live in the Federal housing areas which sprang up, almost tripled.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman seeks to reinstate that portion which was authorized by the first session of the Eightieth Congress, is that not correct?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Approximately, but not quite.

Mr. COLMER. Not quite all of it?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is right.

Mr. COLMER. But the House had authorized it, and the Committee on Appropriations cut it down during the last session to approximately half.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is correct. And may I say to the gentleman at this point that I am aware of his interest in this matter and of his strenuous efforts over a long period of time to secure Federal aid for our schools. He is to be commended for his excellent work.

Mr. COLMER. I just want to say I am for the gentleman's amendment and I hope the House will concur in it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The amount which these small schools would get would still be \$500,000 less than the House authorized for the schools.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I can name right offhand four districts in my State that are in exactly the condition the gentleman describes. I am for the amendment heartily.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. Some difficulty exists in many of the school districts of my own State, as the gentleman knows, one particularly in the Hanford area. Forty thousand people came into that one area where there were no people living before. The school district there is a Federal project. The people come there to work for the Federal Government, and most of them are veterans. The Federal Government has the responsibility of providing necessary facilities not only for housing but for carrying on the schooling of these children where the local people have no opportunity at all to afford the schooling which the Federal Government has been affording.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman.

There are Members who come from areas that do not have this problem and the question may occur to them as to the efforts being made by the local school

district or by the State. Referring again to this situation in the town of Renton, their resources are limited, and approximately 60 percent of the tax money paid by the citizens of that school district goes for school purposes. So the local areas are contributing to their fullest extent to cover their school costs. The State government likewise is doing everything that it possibly can within the limitation imposed by the constitution and the laws of the State of Washington.

Now, a further question arises with respect to tax money from the housing areas. These housing areas are federally owned and cannot be taxed. It is true that the Federal Government makes payments in lieu of taxes, but it is agreed that that amount of money paid in lieu of taxes does not meet the need. There is no need to go into detail in the matter of Federal aid advanced to these districts, because that matter was fully covered when the Lanham Act was passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we can get a limitation on debate. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks after the vote on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I think it is a very worth-while, fair, and desirable amendment. After much debate last year the Congress authorized \$5,000,000 to help out these weak school districts whose enrollment had been vastly increased because of definite war activities.

It was not any catch-all proposition, it was carefully limited to about 193 Lanham Act schools that had this unusual enrollment burden placed upon them—this staggering burden—because of the location of war plants and industries, Boeing Aircraft, Douglas Aircraft, or some other big war installation. We therefore put money in the authorization bill because of this Government responsibility.

Although their estimate was that they required \$5,500,000 it was reduced by the

House to \$5,000,000. This Appropriations Committee is reducing the amount authorized by \$1,200,000. They are even cutting \$700,000 from the bare minimum recommended by the Public Works Administration. This administration has already reduced the schools' total requests of \$5,500,000 down to \$4,914,000.

In other words, there has been a burden of several hundred thousands already placed on these schools of money that they will not get and now we are cutting it further, \$650,000 in addition to this reduction.

I know it will be argued by the Appropriations Committee that \$614,000 of this money represents a deficit for the preceding year. It does represent a deficit, but in all of the past history of the administration of this act we have covered those deficits within the current year's appropriation.

So what in effect we will be doing if we deny this additional \$700,000 to these 135 small school districts is short-changing them by \$700,000. We are going to take it out of the educational budgets of these small schools burdened by this increased enrollment that was placed on them by the mighty United States Government. We are refusing to go along with our plain and simple responsibility if we refuse this \$700,000 appropriation. Remember that it is still \$500,000 less than the House itself has authorized for this emergency school work.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my voice to that of others who are urging that the amount for the Federal Works Agency, to be used for certain public schools, be increased from \$1,300,000 to the full amount of the budget estimate of \$2,000,000. Let it be remembered that all of this and more has been authorized.

This valuable help to schools which found themselves faced with building and personnel problems, because of war-swollen population in certain areas, has meant a great deal to many of the Arizona schools, just as it has to schools throughout our country. Without it they could not have carried on. Certain of them in Arizona would have found it impossible to meet those after-war problems, and even today some of the same schools are still handling overloads that are a direct consequence of shifting populations due to war activities. As I indicated to the gentleman offering the amendment, such is the case of Issac school district and Washington school district on the outskirts of Phoenix, and Sunnyside school district and Amphitheater school district on the outskirts of Tucson. I have now in my office pleas from officials of the schools and from school-board members, urging that I do everything possible to continue these Federal funds, as otherwise their educational activities would have to be limited through part-time classes or greatly overloaded classes; or through reduction in the length of the school term.

At the same time that we are helping democratic forces abroad, let us not forget that the very basis of democracy—and the only hope for its continuation—lies in an educated and well-informed

citizenry. Let us remember this, as we vote on this particular item to make more funds available for the education of American children in areas made critical by war conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SANBORN].

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the pending amendment because of the condition of schools in my district. The Pocatello school has been under a heavy expense in providing school facilities for children belonging to employees of the naval gun rearming establishment and the school authorities find themselves in a very difficult situation on this account. I know that the committee is taking the position that under this law deficits from previous years cannot be considered. As a matter of fact, however, the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, Frank L. Yates, rendered an opinion to the committee on this point, from which I quote the following:

As the indebtedness of a particular school district is a legal obligation which it cannot avoid, I think it only reasonable to regard such obligation as in the nature of an encumbrance upon the income of the school district and that, in a real sense, such portion of its income is not available for maintenance and operation expenses within the contemplation of the agreements entered into between the school agencies and the Federal Government. In other words, the amount which is actually available for such expenses is represented by the net funds remaining from estimated income after deduction of such amounts as may be required to satisfy proper obligations incurred in the prior school year. For these reasons, this method of determining the amount of the Government's contribution for school purposes is not believed to be prohibited by Public Law 317, supra, and, so far as this office is concerned, no objection thereto will be interposed.

Mr. Chairman, that answers the objections that the committee has raised in connection with this matter. It is certainly necessary to have more money in this appropriation than the bill calls for. In previous appropriations there has been an actual deficit and that deficit has not been taken care of. As a result, deficits have occurred in these schools.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANBORN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. If this amendment is agreed to will it then go beyond the authorization of the amounts provided for these schools such as the gentleman has described?

Mr. SANBORN. I think not.

Mr. DONDERO. How much is left of the \$5,000,000 that was authorized and not yet appropriated?

Mr. SANBORN. About a half-million dollars, I believe, which is being processed at the present time.

Mr. DONDERO. The bill has in it \$1,300,000. The amendment would raise that to \$2,000,000. Will that take it beyond the amount authorized by the Congress?

Mr. SANBORN. I think not.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANBORN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. GOFF. In confirmation of the gentleman's statement here may I read the following telegram which I have just received:

POCATELLO, IDAHO, April 1, 1948.

Congressman ABE GOFF,

House of Representatives:

Actual deficit due Pocatello schools unpaid by Federal Government through Lanham Act now called Landis Act on June 30, 1947, \$19,156.23. Entreat you appear before lower House this afternoon with this telegram and present Pocatello status. Thanks.

GEORGE N. GREEN,

Superintendent of Schools.

This represents the amount that should have been paid by the Government to the school.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this particular cause is one for which I have a great deal of sympathy. Last year I introduced one of the first bills that proposed to establish a fund so that the various Federal agencies which create common school problems in various parts of the country might have the funds to meet the educational responsibilities that developed. That was a very broad bill. Several other Members of the House introduced similar bills.

The matter was considered by the Committee on Education and Labor. I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS] will recall the history of the legislation because he was helpful in the presentation that was made. When the presentation was made to the Committee on Education and Labor it became evident that the amount involved, if we took up the problem of providing schooling for the national parks and the national forests and all the military reservations and all the public housing projects, would be so large that the Committee on Education and Labor just backed away from it and said, "We cannot tackle that problem at this time." Then an emergency arose for we had the expiration of the Lanham Act facing us, and we sought to get a bill through to provide money for this purpose. I personally wrote the text of the bill on which this appropriation is made, and it was introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS]. We wrote it as we did so that it could be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, which heard the testimony, rather than as an amendment of the Lanham Act which would have gone to the Public Works Committee. We did that for the purpose of expediting consideration by getting the bill before the committee which had heard the whole testimony. It was in the closing days of the session. The bill passed the House. The Budget estimate was sent before the Senate and there, growing out of an item that was put in the Senate and growing out of the conference, \$2,500,000 was provided. The budget estimates came up for an additional \$2,000,000 this year. The reason that the Committee on Appropriations has recommended \$1,300,000

is that that is in accord with the analysis of the problem made by the administrative agency.

On page 13 of the hearings Mr. Field said:

To date we have not financed any of the last year's deficit because I felt there was a question in the minds of our own staff as to whether or not, due to the limited funds available, we should finance a deficit that occurred prior to July 1, 1947.

And General Fleming, who is the head of the Public Works Agency, in making the request for the funds before the Senate committee testified:

These funds will be used in aid of maintenance and operation of schools, 1947-48.

I am taking this position because I think good faith requires it in keeping with the presentation that was made as to what this money was to be used for, which was for the use of schools to meet their operating expenses in 1947 and 1948. It is true that the Comptroller General has said that it is not illegal to use some of the money to pay for deficits of prior years, but that is not in keeping with the plea on which the bill was originally presented. And let me suggest to you that there is a very bad principle involved there if we recognize the principle that school districts or any local taxing body can make up its budget as it pleases and pass its deficits off to the Federal Government. We have then surrendered to local taxing bodies the right to make levies upon the Federal Treasury. The amendment should be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is slightly in error in his recital of the history of this school aid appropriation. I know he did not intend to be but he, like the balance of us, has many things on his mind these days.

The authorization for aid to schools in the war congested areas was for \$5,000,000 as he has said. The appropriation bill containing it was brought up in the House in almost the closing hours of the first session of the Eightieth Congress last July. And in ironing out differences between the House and Senate bills, the appropriation was reduced \$2,500,000. I, among others, opposed that and in the House debate pointed out that according to the best estimates we could get, the whole \$5,000,000 would be needed. However, I recall distinctly that several other Members suggested that since the estimates might be in error, we should concur in the \$2,500,000 appropriation, and that if it should be found that the amount so appropriated was insufficient, a deficiency appropriation could be passed during the second session of the Eightieth Congress making up the needed amount.

The appropriate agency administering this law requested a deficiency appropriation of \$2,000,000 in the present bill. But the appropriation committee has cut that to \$1,300,000. The sum eliminated by the committee was requested for the purpose of paying to something more than 130 schools, most of them small, the sums still due them on commitments of prior years which were not fully paid because of lack of funds.

Now this came about not by reason of any error in the budget estimates of the schools, as the gentleman from South Dakota suggested. It came about because commitments made to those schools by the appropriate Government agency were not paid in full. I think we will be setting no bad precedent whatever to up the appropriation in this bill to the \$2,000,000 requested. These funds are badly needed by the schools. It may be that this does not represent a debt of the United States Government in a legal sense, but to my way of thinking it does represent a moral obligation, and I trust you will vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, prior to World War II the normal enrollment in school district No. 4, Charleston County, S. C., was 4,000 students. As a result of naval shipbuilding activities and other military installations activities the enrollment reached a top figure of 10,356. Since the war the enrollment dropped to 8,838 in 1947, a mere 15 percent of maximum influx. The large increase in enrollment was due to the increase in Federal activities in school district No. 4. The largest of these Federal industries is the Charleston naval shipyard. It, according to a recent newspaper statement by the Commandant, employs more persons than any other industry in South Carolina. The Army installations have virtually closed out, but the people they brought there are still living where they were during the war, in Cooper River School District No. 4. Most of the property is permanently off the tax books, the ones now in existence are not assessed for tax purposes inasmuch as they are owned either by the Federal Government or the State. The school district is facing a deficit in operating funds. The only fair solution is Federal assistance, which may be done through continuation of the Lanham Act.

Another situation in the First Congressional District of South Carolina is at Beaufort, adjacent to Parris Island, the Marine boot training camp. Beaufort is also the location of a new \$10,000,000 naval hospital. Again, the only fair solution is Federal assistance, which may be done through continuation of the Lanham Act. Accordingly, I urge such continuation, for at least another year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TOLLEFSON) there were—ayes 42, noes 51.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 68, noes 65.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, the action of the House of Representatives on Spain and the European recovery program is perhaps a diplomatic disaster that can be repaired. So Mr. Walter Lippmann says this morning in his syndicated column that goes throughout the Nation. What he means is, of course, that the conferees still have a chance to repair the injury done to our foreign policy in the hasty action that was taken by the House of Representatives.

Mr. Lippmann is not alone in describing our action as a diplomatic disaster. The newspaper columnists and the radio commentators of this Nation and the world have been talking these last 48 hours about the unfortunate vote that was taken in the House. The amendment was adopted, let us remember, after a few minutes of hasty debate. Never did so many people know so little about so much as when the Members voted on the Spain amendment.

The founding fathers, when they wrote our Constitution, never intended that the foreign policy of this Nation was to be formulated in heated, ill-considered, and hasty debate by the lower House. Foreign policy that affects our national security into the far future demands mature consideration. It cannot be arrived at in the manner in which we adopted the amendment on Spain.

This amendment has not changed the position of Spain in relation to the other nations of Europe. Those who are friends of the present Government of Spain have not brought Spain into the European recovery program by this amendment.

But the 188 Members that voted for this amendment have given a club to the Communists in Europe and around the world to beat over the head the liberals who are fighting for free government today. We have greatly jeopardized the chances of the non-Communist forces to win the Italian election. Is that what we wanted?

The 188 Members that voted for this amendment struck a blow at the United Nations, which passed a resolution to which we were a party, condemning the Franco government. Is this what the House of Representatives wanted?

The amendment was a blow to the leadership of the United States within the United Nations. Is that what the House of Representatives wanted? The manner in which the vote was taken on Spain is something that we ought to re-examine, so that in the future when we proceed to make foreign policy on the highest level in this lower House, we will understand what we are doing and we will understand that we cannot act in the hasty, ill-considered manner in which we acted on Spain if we intend to retain our Nation's place of leadership in the world and if we intend to win the

ideological battle upon which we have embarked everywhere in the world.

Do we not know that arms alone cannot guarantee our national security? I pose the question asked by Sumner Welles, "Are we prepared to agree that our moral prestige and the confidence of other peoples in the good faith of this country are no longer vital elements of our national security?"

Are we prepared to become the champions of fascism wherever it exists in the world?

We must not in our efforts to oppose communism take steps which destroy our moral integrity.

I pray that the conferees will repair the damage that has been done.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services: For an additional amount for administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services, \$3,000,000.

Mr. PEDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PEDEN: On page 9, line 5, after "administration", insert "including necessary contact representatives."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEDEN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I have no personal objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PEDEN. I am pleased to know that we are all in accord in recognizing the valuable service rendered by the contact representatives. The recent reduction in this type of service in many parts of the country is working great hardships on the veterans. This is the real grass-root service of the Veterans' Administration and should be maintained in every instance where possible. This amendment will make certain the reinstatement of all the necessary contact representatives who have been notified to close such services to the veterans.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Chairman, in connection with our consideration of additional appropriations for the Veterans' Administration, I am prompted to make an observation with reference to Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of that Agency.

Today marks the completion of the third month of his incumbency of that office. At the time his appointment was announced by President Truman, I advised my colleagues of the House of the splendid background, training, and character Mr. Gray possessed and predicted for him a highly successful term of office. His management of the affairs of the Veterans' Administration in the last 3 months furnishes the best evidence of the truth of my previous observations. It can truly be said that we now have an exceptionally able Administrator of the largest of our Government agencies. In recent appearances before the Appropriations Committee in connection with the issuance of orders providing for a reduction of personnel in order to keep within his appropriations, I am advised that he impressed the members of the committee with his ability, forthright-

ness, and sound character. I am sure that Carl Gray believes that it is his function to administer the veterans' laws in the manner and spirit in which they are enacted by the Congress and within the fiscal limitations prescribed by it. Although his recent order prescribing a reduction in personnel was not a pleasant act for him to perform, it was done in order to maintain his agency within the congressional appropriations of money, and is evidentiary of his desire to manage the Veterans' Administration in accordance with the rule book. The Government has long needed able men like General Gray.

We wish General Gray continued success in office. His many years of responsible executive experience and the record he has established in the first 3 months of office furnishes every reason for our belief that he will go on and establish for himself a record as an outstanding Government Administrator.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. PEDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Loans: The authorization under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1948, for borrowings from the Secretary of the Treasury under section 3 (a) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, is increased from "\$225,000,000" to "\$300,000,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON: On page 10, line 7, strike out "\$300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$400,000,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the merits of the Rural Electrification Administration have been debated so often and so exhaustively here on the floor that Members of the House are familiar with its advantages and its needs. So I shall not take the time of the House to discuss it except to say that if you comb over the entire rural area of the United States this afternoon you would not find a single farmer in the entire United States who does not favor adequate provision for its support. The farmers of America sometimes find it difficult to get together. They may disagree on many matters, but there is one thing on which they are unanimously agreed, and that is on the benefits of the Rural Electrification Administration and the importance of providing adequate facilities for its maintenance and expansion.

And I think, Mr. Chairman, there is no Member of the House of Representatives here this afternoon who is not thoroughly convinced of the invaluable service rendered by Rural Electrification to rural America in particular and the Nation in general.

The only question then, which presents itself here this afternoon in connection with this amendment is the amount needed for the development and wholesome growth of REA at this time and the advantage of making provision for the full budget estimate at this time.

For that is all we are asking in this amendment. That the Committee instead of cutting the appropriation \$100,-

000,000 below the budget estimate, allow the full amount.

It is purely a mathematical proposition at this time, according to the most recently ascertainable data, there are pending applications requiring \$306,000,000 in loans. And there will accumulate during the coming fiscal year applications requiring \$500,000,000 additional funds. Under the terms of the bill this appropriation will be available after the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1948, and will require, even for the loans now in sight, a minimum of \$806,000,000 between the date of the approval of this act and June 30, 1949.

To meet this need of \$806,000,000 to finance applications already in sight, we will have the \$400,000,000 carried in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, and the \$75,000,000 proposed by the committee in this bill. That will be only \$475,000,000 to supply \$806,000,000 needed in the next 15 months.

Even if you provide the full \$175,000,000, the full budget estimate, as provided by the pending amendment, we will still have only \$575,000,000 in funds to meet \$806,000,000 in applications. There are farmers all over the Nation who have had their applications for current on file for 2 and 3 years. Many have had their houses and barns wired, and appliances installed, for months; but they are without service because we have not appropriated enough money to process their loans. It is true, as the chairman will say, that poles and copper wire and transformers are not immediately available; but the sooner they are ordered, the sooner they will be delivered, and without this appropriation we cannot file their orders.

I could understand the committee's position if this item and this appropriation involved a grant or a gratuity or a contribution of any kind on the part of the Government. But it is not a grant. It is a loan. And it is a loan on the best of security. It is a loan which will be paid back with interest. There is in neither this paragraph of the bill, nor in this amendment, a charge of a single penny against the United States Treasury. It is strictly a business transaction with the undisputed assurance that the Government will get back, not only the principal of the loan in full, but substantial interest as well, a highly attractive investment.

And it means increased health, happiness, and prosperity for the farm family. It is a proposition in which the Government has everything to gain and nothing to lose.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I believe the gentleman will agree that the security required by the REA on these loans is such that they must be repaid. It is not a question of dishing out as we did in the bill we passed yesterday. We are going to get back this money, and get it back with interest. Am I not correct?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is eminently correct. The collateral is the best security in the world based on monthly cash payments for service which may be

discontinued for nonpayment. The experience of REA over the dozen years since it was initiated in 1936 has been one of continued repayment of loans before maturity and prompt liquidation of all accrued interest.

I trust the amendment will be agreed to and the full amount of the budget estimate provided.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, last year we appropriated for this year or provided loan funds totaling \$225,000,000. Of those figures they have been able to allocate \$155,000,000 to the twelfth day of March. Under those circumstances when the budget estimate was submitted for increasing this figure by \$175,000,000 we felt that the item should be analyzed and that we should know what was going on. Mr. Wickard stated that they probably could allocate \$81,000,000 the rest of the year. We have provided an increase of \$75,000,000. Let me read you a little bit of Mr. Wickard's testimony out of the hearings. You will remember that the Agriculture Committee gave Mr. Wickard for this particular purpose \$100,000,000 more than the budget estimate, and then gave him \$400,000,000 to be used next year. Now listen to what Mr. Wickard says about this picture on page 1284 of the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. Have you taken into consideration in making that statement the amount that this committee has recommended?

Mr. WICKARD. That is what I was just about to speak of. We did not know when we made the recommendation for \$175,000,000 a little over 2 months ago that the committee was going to recommend the \$400,000,000 which the committee recommended yesterday.

In other words, they did not know that they were going to get this \$400,000,000 that was given to them in the agricultural appropriation bill the other day. This estimate was put up without their knowing anything about it. Now, Mr. Wickard tells us that this amount that we cut out will be carried over, if it is provided, into next year and we give him about \$500,000,000 to allocate because they cannot allocate much more than the \$81,000,000 that he talks about the rest of this year. All of their allocations have been larger this year than the expenditures. The expenditures have been behind the allocations and they have just been building up a great big pile of allocations.

I want to see the program go ahead, but what happens when you try to crowd it too hard and try to get too much money? You create in the market a great big backlog of demand for these generators, copper wire and all that sort of thing which are required to go ahead with these electrical activities. You delay, you increase the price, you create inflation; you really hurt the farmer and make this stuff cost the farmer more money. The fellow who is really interested in this thing and really wants to see it move ahead in an intelligent way, wants to see it done in an orderly manner so that the orders that flow into the factories for these things will not be so much more than the factories are able to take care of. You are really not im-

proving your position if you go ahead and increase this item.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support of the pending amendment. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I have an identical amendment to that offered by the gentleman from Missouri on the Speaker's desk. It seems to me that if we are going to keep the construction of the REA projects proceeding in a satisfactory and orderly manner this amendment must be adopted. We have a critical power situation in my State and in many of the States of the West and Northwest. I have read over the entire hearings in connection with this item and it seems to me that in view of the fact that the Rural Electrification Administration has a terrific backlog of loan applications, many of which were made before the last war, we have waited long enough to catch up on these applications. It is true that the Administration has been making allotments of around \$23,000,000 per month but the Administrator stated at the hearings that if funds were available the program could be accelerated so that they could process loan applications and make allocations of upward of thirty-five or forty million dollars per month.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is another reason why this item should be increased from seventy-five to one hundred and seventy-five million dollars. Under the basic law, the Administrator is required to allot 50 percent of the appropriation in proportion to the number of unelectrified farms in each State, as compared with the number of unelectrified farms in the country, and so half of the money appropriated here today must be allocated with a certain proportion to each State, according to that formula. It must be borne in mind that these funds must be held for the various States until the end of the fiscal year. The remainder of the funds may be distributed among the States with the proviso that not more than 10 percent may go to any one State. As it stands today, the Rural Electrification Administration has around \$57,000,000 that has not been loaned but all of those funds have been committed.

And so it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that inasmuch as all of the funds available to the administration have been loaned, and because of the fact that the Administrator is required to allot one-half of the moneys appropriated to the several States of the Union that certainly if the Administrator is going to take care of the urgent applications already approved in the field and presently in his hands here in Washington, that this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an observation. Because of lack of funds the REA cooperatives in the various counties of my district particularly have been unable to place orders for equipment and sup-

plies which they need to extend their lines, whereas the utility companies can always place their orders. They have the funds with which to pay for them, therefore, they get the preference in the delivery of those orders, thereby delaying construction of REA projects.

Mr. BARRETT. The gentleman is exactly right. Last year rural electric service was extended to 345,000 new REA consumers. About 80 percent of them are farmers. The fact is that the Inter-mountain and Western States have more applications than any other section of the country. In fact we have a backlog of over \$2,500,000 of applications in the State of Wyoming alone. There is more oil development in Wyoming than in any other State in the Union at the present time. People living in the oil fields and the operators themselves are desperately in need of power that is unavailable to them.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. They cannot order the material until the funds are in their hands.

Mr. BARRETT. That is precisely right. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I would also like to make a little statement to help clarify this situation, if I may.

This amendment, in effect, raises by \$175,000,000 the appropriation made in the Agriculture supply bill last year for fiscal 1948, the current year. This is raised because of the tremendous backlogs, some of them existing since 1939, of work that ought to be done on extensions of existing REA's. The money will not be withdrawn from the Treasury nor become an obligation until it has actually gone through contractual arrangements and supplies have been bought to extend lines. But, in order for them to contract in the market, in competition with utilities and other co-operative enterprises, it is necessary that we appropriate the money, which will not be spent except as I have indicated. Now, I think it is significant that the Administration only requested of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1949 \$325,000,000. The Department of Agriculture brought to the House in the President's budget \$300,000,000 which our Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations raised to \$400,000,000. There was no deficiency request before the Congress when we wrote up that appropriation bill. There was only a request for three hundred million. The action of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, therefore, and this amendment, if it prevails, will make available for REA a total of \$575,000,000 for the servicing of applications which

today aggregate a little over \$600,000,000. Not all of those have been tested for feasibility; not all of those will be accepted by the REA. But I think at long last we have cleared the decks through the work of our Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations and the good work today of the deficiency committee in bringing this bill to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, a while ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] read from the testimony of Mr. Wickard at page 1284 of the hearings. I want to read some testimony of Mr. Wickard from the same page that the gentleman did not read. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] was questioning Mr. Wickard, and he asked him:

Now, in view of the fact Congress will appropriate that \$400,000,000, is it in the best interest of the acceleration of the REA program for us also to appropriate this deficiency of \$175,000,000.

Mr. WICKARD. Yes; it will be in the interest of the program.

Mr. MAHON. And what is the reason why?

Mr. WICKARD. Because it will give us money now to keep the program going, and money left over can be used next year and can be used without restrictions in the formula.

Briefly, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] these REA co-ops have to go into the market for the materials and place their orders many, many months in advance in competition with private buyers. They cannot pledge an allocation or make a contract for the delivery of these things unless the money has been actually appropriated and allocated even though it may not be used during the year. So, we are simply handicapping these REA co-ops in keeping their program going continuously by refusing them these appropriations, as was pointed out by Mr. Wickard.

In my own district we have hundreds and hundreds of miles of lines awaiting construction, for which the people have made their deposits and have had them up as much as 2, 2½, and 3 years, waiting for this necessary service. I think we can well afford to add this additional \$175,000,000 to keep that program going at full speed. It is doing a great deal for the rural people of our Nation, adding to the development of our Nation, and for the welfare of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I feel that we can be liberal in this appropriation. It is simply an authorization for loans. The record of the REA co-ops is one that may well be followed by other organizations that ask for public funds. They have paid the installments in advance, and in addition they have paid the interest on installments before due. It seems to me that no person should object to seeing to it that the farms of this Nation are electrified. I know the committee has been liberal, but I feel it can be a little more liberal than it has been in this matter. In my State there are 22,000 applications which cannot be considered because, I am in-

formed by the Administration, there are not sufficient funds allotted to that State for them to accept these applications. Let us accept them, especially since so many Members were so liberal when they voted funds for foreign nations.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The applications for the gentleman's State are a little more than \$22,000,000, instead of 22,000.

Mr. LEMKE. Twenty-two thousand applications amounting to \$22,000,000.

My State is one of the States least electrified. We are in arrears many millions of dollars, for the reason that during the war no construction was possible. I get letters nearly every day from people who say, "We have had our application in for 5 years and have not had any action on it." So I do hope the Committee will see fit to allow this extra \$100,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON) there were—ayes 77, noes 79.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Penalty mail costs: For an additional amount for "Penalty mail costs," \$35,000.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise only to point out that in this one small item of \$35,000 for penalty mail costs, on page 11 of the bill, there are sufficient funds for the rest of this fiscal year to take care of the fish-marketing reports for the commercial-fishing industry all over the country. I am taking this time only to point out that I called this to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations a very short time ago, and he acted very promptly to get this small item in the bill. It will be of immense assistance to the commercial-fishing industry throughout the country.

I am indebted to David Hart, of the Atlantic Fishermen's Union, for bringing this deficiency to my attention and permitting me to correct it.

Mr. PEDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at that point in the RECORD where I offered an amendment in regard to the Veterans' Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system: For an additional amount for "Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system," \$625,000, to remain available until expended, and to be subject to such limitations and restrictions, except as to operation and maintenance and personal services in the District of Columbia, as may be applicable to appropriations for this purpose in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, or other law and the limitation under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, on the

amount available for operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system, is increased from "2,500,000" to "\$2,600,000," and the limitation under said head on the amount available for personal services in the District of Columbia is increased from "\$24,000" to "\$24,500": *Provided*, That in addition to the contract authorizations contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, and the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, the Administrator is authorized to contract in the fiscal year 1948 for materials, equipment, and services for power transmission facilities in an amount not in excess of \$1,475,000.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, as brought out by my interrogation of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], earlier in the day, this item for the Bonneville Power Administration covers the amount of the budget estimate with the exception of the reduction of \$100,000 for operation and maintenance. It includes an appropriation of \$625,000 plus contractual authorization in the sum of \$1,450,000.

I know those of you who have followed the development of hydroelectric power on the Columbia River realize that these projects have returned to us manyfold the moneys expended on them. As I have often pointed out, approximately one-third of the aluminum produced during World War II came from the Columbia River area, made possible by hydroelectric power developed in these plants. As was recently announced by the Bonneville Power Administration the Bonneville project is repaying the Federal Government for the moneys invested ahead of schedule.

Mr. Chairman, as I remarked on this floor heretofore, the Bonneville Power Administration has recently announced that a special advance payment of \$2,100,000 has been made to the account of the Bonneville Dam project. This was good news. It shows that Uncle Sam has a sound investment in the Columbia River Dam projects. I said at that time I intended to call this to the attention of the Appropriations Committees with jurisdiction over these projects when requests for funds for further Northwest resource developments were being considered. I want them to know that their judgment was sound in that funds invested in the Columbia River Basin are gilt-edged.

It is gratifying to know that these great multiple-purpose projects are paying out ahead of the dates which were originally fixed for reimbursing the Federal Government for the moneys invested.

The surplus earnings to date, if continued, will result in a full repayment of the Bonneville Dam project 5 years ahead of schedule. Payments on the Columbia Basin project, namely, Grand Coulee, are also ahead of schedule, thereby making possible pay-out according to schedule despite the increased construction cost of the Grand Coulee facilities.

The Bonneville Dam project, which includes the dam, powerhouses, and accessory facilities constructed and operated by the Corps of Engineers, has, through the fiscal year 1947, received repayment, interest, and operating-ex-

pense credit on the books of the Treasury in the amount of \$18,562,150.

About February 10, 1948, an additional advance payment of \$2,100,000 was made on the books of the Treasury toward amortizing the cost of the power facilities of the Bonneville Dam project. This was made possible by a request by the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the agreement between the Army Engineers operating the Bonneville Dam and the Bonneville Administration which is marketing the power. This \$2,100,000 special additional or advance payment to the account of the Bonneville Dam project was an additional payment over and above the regular pay-out schedule payment of \$3,119,850 for the year ending June 30, 1948. This special additional or advance payment was made possible by the fact that the power revenues from the Columbia projects exceed the estimates and are so running as to produce an annual surplus. The payments made from the Bonneville Administration to the Bonneville Dam project exceeded the minimum repayment requirements to the extent that as of January 1, 1948, repayments are \$2,252,282 ahead of schedule requirements.

The revenues derived from the sale of power by Bonneville Power Administration, according to statute, are to be used to pay the operating expenses of the Bonneville Power Administration, the Army Engineers operating the Bonneville Dam, and the Bureau of Reclamation operating the Grand Coulee Dam. In addition, out of these revenues are to be paid the annual amortization of the Federal investment in these three agencies and the annual interest charges on the unamortized investment balance. The bookkeeping on these three projects is handled by the Bonneville Power Administration and it is audited annually by independent outside commercial auditors. Based on such an audit is the pay-out schedule showing annual payments to fully cover all the cost items of the Federal investment.

Through the fiscal year 1947 the revenues derived from the sale of power amounted to \$101,165,847. These revenues have been and will be deposited with the United States Treasury, and are, and will be, distributed on the books of the Treasury so that the interest and amortization investment account of the power facilities will always show the annual and cumulative contributions toward full interest and capital repayment, as well as meeting annual operating, maintenance and replacement costs.

Power from the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams is transmitted over the transmission grid system of the Bonneville Power Administration, which serves the major load centers of the States of Oregon and Washington. The power sales are presently running at an annual rate of about \$22,100,000. The additional generators brought in at the Grand Coulee Dam between 1948 and 1952 will increase the annual power revenues to approximately \$30,000,000, with total revenues in excess of \$270,000,000 during the next 10 years.

These results show what can be accomplished if abundant, firm, and low-

cost power is available for resource development.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee for their fair treatment of this most worthy project.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Salaries and expenses, Reservation Administration: For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Reservation Administration," including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, \$1,000.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. D'EWARD: Page 13, after line 16, insert "Emergency work program, Navajo and Hopi Indians: For expenses necessary for administering and carrying out a work program for the Navajo and Hopi Indians, in accordance with the act of December 19, 1947 (Public Law 390), including personal services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding: \$1,000,000, to remain available until July 30, 1949."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWARD. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I understand that the gentleman has had considerable discussion during the day with the subcommittee handling appropriations for the Department of the Interior and that they have agreed with him on a breakdown which I would like to see put into the Record at this point as to how this \$1,000,000 might be spent.

Mr. D'EWARD. That is my intention.

Mr. TABER. So far as I am concerned I do not object to this amendment in this form. I want to say if I may be permitted that I have been terribly disappointed at the performance of the Indian Bureau in connection with this Navajo business and the way they have used the funds out of the relief money to build up personnel, buying automobiles, and things of that kind. I hope we will get better results in the future.

Mr. D'EWARD. I might say to the chairman of the committee that we have taken that matter into consideration in going into this request for additional funds for the Hopi and Navajo Indians. I took this matter up with Mr. JENSEN, chairman of the Interior Department Subcommittee, and with Mr. SCHWABE, who is chairman of the Indian Affairs Appropriation Subcommittee. They have agreed on the break-down. I think if this break-down is followed out, it will eliminate the things that you criticize as having happened with the previous appropriations. The break-down is as follows:

Hospital repair and modernization	\$100,000
School repair and modernization	100,000
Health activities, hospital facilities, doctors, nurses, etc.	100,000
Soil and moisture conservation including fertilizer and irrigation	250,000
Revolving fund for loans and purchase of milk animals	100,000
Road construction and repair	200,000
Expenses necessary in connection with off-reservation work	150,000
Total	1,000,000

I believe if this break-down is followed out the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will not have occasion again to make the criticism that he has just made. This appropriation is in pursuance of the authorization which was voted by the Congress earlier in the year. It is a continuation of the program for which we voted \$500,000 earlier in the session. It is a beginning of the long-range program which has recently been sent to the Public Lands Committee for study. We have not had the opportunity of studying that long-range program, but I hope to take it up this month. Every one of the features in this appropriation will be supplemented later by the long-range program. I think it is in the interest of the Navajo and Hopi Indians. I think that this program should be started. I think it is a step in the best interests of the Indians and for the welfare of the Hopi and Navajos.

I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I wish at this time to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the members of the committee in approving the amount specified in the amendment under consideration. It will carry the Navajos and Hopi Indians over until a more extensive program is arranged for their welfare.

Mr. D'EWARD. As chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee I want to express my conviction of the need and my appreciation of the cooperation of the Appropriations Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Montana: Flathead, \$125,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this means to thank the subcommittee on Interior Appropriations for approving an item of \$125,000 to extend and construct electrical service lines in the Flathead Indian project area. This will allow sufficient funds to carry forward construction during the remainder of this fiscal year and until additional funds can be provided in the regular 1949 Appropriation Act.

To the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, the Honorable BEN JENSEN, chairman of the subcommittee, to the Honorable IVOR FENTON, the Honorable LOWELL STOCKMAN, the Honorable GEORGE SCHWABE, the Honorable MIKE KIRWAN, ranking minority member, the Honorable WILLIAM NORRELL, and the Honorable ALBERT GORE I want to express the appreciation of the men and women of Montana who will benefit from the consideration and understanding shown by this committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

QUARTERMASTER SERVICE, ARMY

Clothing and equipment: For an additional amount for "Clothing and equipment," \$10,000,000.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: On page 18, strike out lines 1 to 4 inclusive.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I hope it is thoroughly understood that the remarks I will make are in no way disparaging to the members of the Air Force or the exploits which they have already performed and which they may be called upon to perform in the future. I am speaking as a matter of principle.

This proposal contained in these lines involves more than the matter of \$10,000,000. You will be told that the thing will be only \$2,500,000. That is subject to debate. This is to provide congressional approval for the Air Force to procure and wear light-blue uniforms with chevrons considerably different than those worn in the past by members of the armed forces.

Just a short time ago we passed a bill which called for the unification of the armed services. We anticipated that this action would wipe out some of the jealousies between the branches of the service. I can tell you, with no doubt in my mind, that if this program is adopted, you will have greater division than you have had heretofore. You will have greatly intensified rivalry and jealousy, in view of the fact that the Air Force with its many privileges, including flying pay, already occupies an enviable position. The results to be obtained will not be those claimed by some of its proponents. They point out, of course, that the marines have a separate uniform. Their arguments, as far as logic is concerned, fall absolutely flat.

They tell you that they need this program to increase the morale of the Air Force. Morale? There is no outfit, except possibly the marines, that has a higher morale than the Air Force. That is shown by the fact that in their enlistment program they are now 7,000 above the figure permitted by the budget.

They say that this is necessary to create a greater interest in the Air Force. I do not know how we can have any greater interest, every youngster in America is interested in aviation. If new uniforms are a matter of necessity for building up morale and bringing in more voluntary recruits to the armed forces the place that you need them is in the Ground Forces. Think back to the days of the war and see these doughboys crawling on their bellies in the mud and along the hedgerows of France; in the snow and slush of Germany; fighting their way through the jungles of Pacific islands day after day after day and then spending the night where it overtook them, exhausted, grimy, dirty, hungry. They could not look forward to the fact that when their assignment was over they would be flown back to comfortable beds, warm barracks, hot coffee, good food,

clean clothes, and a hot bath. Talk about needed morale and new uniforms! If they are to be furnished now—give them where they will do the most good. Within a very short time, if this program is adopted, the Army is coming in and say they need new uniforms to build up morale. There is no end to the demands. Some day when this Nation and the world is actually at peace, when the treaties have been signed, when we no longer live under armistice conditions, it may be necessary to bring in a program like this to buoy up the Air Force and the Ground Forces. But today that is not needed. If you will read the headlines in today's papers you will find that you may need something more than blue uniforms for the Air Force in a short time. It could happen.

When I think of all the things that are necessary, when I think of all the pleas that are being made to us for planes, new equipment, and everything else, I am certain that this is not the right time to ask the Congress to O. K. or approve a program for new blue uniforms for the Air Force.

This will set up another precedent. The infantry will come in and tell you it is entitled to have new uniforms too, and I would be inclined to agree if we were at peace.

Here is another practical problem: On every air base throughout the world, wherever they are now or may be, you are going to have on that base members of both the Air Force and the ground force. You will have the Air Force in their blue uniforms, black shoes, distinctive caps, shirts, and ties. The Army forces will be in the traditional and glorious OD's. You will have then the problem of distribution. You will have to have the uniforms of two colors instead of one. Unification was designed to simplify procurement and distribution, not complicate it. If there is going to be a need soon, you might as well keep your supply problems as simple as possible, keep both the Army and Air Force in the now available uniforms of the OD. If this change finally takes place there will be one item alone involving \$17,000,000 for new overcoats. May I point out to the Air Force that the Marines, even though they have their dress blues, are not ashamed to be seen in their dress blues and their field-green overcoats.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated, this is not in derogation of the Air Force at all. I am proud of them and every American should be proud of them, but this is not the time for frills. We are looking now to a time when we may have many and more difficult jobs ahead of us. If the time is as critical as some have told us it is, and possibly they are right, we need more than new uniforms for the Air Force. We need more planes, more ammunition, more guns, and more men. If Air Force figures on recruiting stand up, if they are getting more than they are permitted certainly their argument that these are needed purely for boosting morale falls down.

Before I close I would like to call attention to the fact that last year in connection with the Army appropriation hearings General Spaatz appeared before us and I asked him specifically if there was any program contemplating put-

ting the Air Force in new blue uniforms. Turn to page 624 of last year's hearings and you will find where General Spaatz stated these words: "We are not giving any consideration to such changes." If he did know the change was proposed he should have told us the truth.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. NORBLAD. Is it not a fact that the Air Force is getting so many men now that they have to put them on a quota basis?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Orders went out some time ago to limit recruiting in the Air Force. Of course, those orders in view of proposed increased strength have since been rescinded.

Mr. Chairman, this new uniform is not necessary at all.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to prepare for security, not for show.

The amendment should prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is a Member of this House who has a greater interest in the air arms of the military services than I have. I think if we could put the whole kit and kaboodle of them into one uniform, the Government, the people of the United States, and the services themselves would be a great deal better off than they are today. Pride in the uniform is a fine thing, but jealousy between the services is accentuated by differences between uniforms. Last year we passed the so-called Unification Act. Instead of resulting in unification it has resulted in triplication. Further accent of triplication by establishment of a new color of uniform is, to me, another step away from the unification we need so badly. I am getting a little sick of this old school tie stuff that I have been running into as chairman of the Combat Aviation Subcommittee of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board. I would like to see them all in the same uniform, perhaps with some little different designation in brass upon the collar. This business of distinguishing between services by different color or cut in uniforms in the United States is going entirely too far. As a matter of fact, if you would put the top brass into civilian clothes and sit them down in one room to argue out their problems, they could come to an agreement an awful lot faster than they can in different uniforms. Therefore, I support this amendment wholeheartedly with the idea that one uniform should ultimately be applied to all services and not different uniforms for each branch of the service.

I have recently introduced a bill, which I believe has gone to the Committee on the Armed Services, to provide for permissive transfer between the services of

all officers in all grades, and I believe that bill, if enacted, will do a great deal to alleviate the present situation in which differences of opinion are so firmly grounded in the separate branches of the armed services. Those differences of opinion would be much better resolved if it were possible for officers to transfer between one branch of the service and another. As a matter of fact, there is a great dearth of experienced officers in the Air Force between the ages of 43 and 53. There is a wide-open space in which naval air officers could go into the Air Force and thereby bring some of the indoctrination which they have received in the Navy Department into the Air Force. It would be a mighty good thing for the Navy and a mighty good thing for the Air Force if that bill were enacted and became law. But so far the Navy Department has opposed it because they are afraid they might lose some officers, forsooth. For goodness sake, if the Navy cannot keep its own officers, with its own attractions and inducements, then they ought to have some of them transferred; but if some of them transfer—and many of them desiring transfer have spoken to me—then there would be some vacancies in the Navy which could be filled by promotion of some of the younger officers, and both the Air Force and the Navy would be better off.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment wholeheartedly, and I hope the appropriation is stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I do not know the origin of the proposal for the blue uniform, but I suppose it had its origin in the fact that the Royal Air Force of England has a distinctive and separate uniform. In World War I, I happened to be in the Marines. I think at the particular age at which I went into the Marines that a great many other boys selected the Marines for the same reason I did. We liked the spirit of the organization. It is possible the uniform contributed to the esprit de corps.

This country is going to be called upon soon for a very substantial increase in its Air Force recruitment. If giving a distinctive uniform will bring boys with the proper spirit into the Air Force I am in favor of them having it.

This proposal does not involve \$10,000,000, although the language in the bill might seem to indicate that. It involves \$2,500,000. The total cost of the change-over after the adjustment is once made is expected to be \$2,500,000. It will cost initially a little bit more, for dyeing of cloth and getting up a stock of goods, but that will simply increase the total number of uniforms, olive drab and blue, that will be on hand initially.

The cloth will be the same; in fact, they are going to use some of the olive drab on hand and simply dye it blue. The air officers testified that the blue would spot less from oil and grease than the OD which turns black.

There is a reason for deciding the matter at this time, one way or the other. The idea has been widely discussed. Officers who need new uniforms have been hesitant as to whether

they should buy some new OD uniforms or buy blue if that is to be the official color. The matter should be settled one way or the other.

I hope you will support the request of the Air Force that they be given this lift for the recruiting that is immediately ahead of them, and support the committee by rejecting the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF].

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, I am like the gentleman from California. I do not think anyone can say I am not in favor of a strong Air Force, because last November I introduced the Air Supremacy Act to build up our Air Force immediately and to appropriate \$5,000,000,000 for that purpose. But I have been tied up with the armed services in some way since I was 17 years old. We have to consider, when we are thinking about the morale of the Air Force, the morale of the other branches of the service. It seems to me that about the worst thing we can do is buy some distinctive fancy new uniforms for the Air Force alone at this time. I am in favor of the proposition stated by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] to give them all some new uniforms but the same kind of uniform. So I hope the Committee will support the amendment. I certainly expect to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I too am not in favor of the Government buying fancy new uniforms for the Air Force. That is not the question. The question is a very simple one. It was necessary to place orders for additional uniforms, but before those orders were placed it was desired that a change be made in the Air Force uniform, not the material. The identical material used for the Army uniform will be used for the Air Force. There will simply be a change in the color. I cannot see any reason why this should not be done. The Navy has its uniform, and so do the Marine Corps, and the Army. Each branch of the service has its uniform. Why should not the Air Force have its uniform? Either all branches of the service should have the same uniform, and there is some argument for such a policy, or else this request of the Air Force should be approved. I am surprised at the objections which have been made.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ENGEL of Michigan) there were—ayes 72, noes 48.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill be considered as read and open for amendment or points of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to that on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to be made to the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, probably the only serious difference of opinion that is yet to be resolved is that in regard to the appropriation of the full \$175,000,000 recommended by the Budget for the REA. There will be a motion to recommit based upon this \$100,000,000 increase for REA. It will be offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the ranking minority member of the committee. All of those who want to give REA the loan funds it must have to meet the needs of our rural people will want to support that motion. I feel that this group should include members of the minority party as well as Democrats. In fact it will be necessary for them to vote for this motion in order to carry out the statements already made in all good faith.

Many members of the majority have publicly stated, and honestly and seriously stated, that the majority party of this House has raised the budget estimate for REA by \$100,000,000. I know that just recently some of my Republican colleagues who went on the trip with the Agriculture Committee through various sections of the country made the repeated statement that the majority party had increased the budget estimate for REA by \$100,000,000.

This was entirely in order. It was a proper and understandable statement. I offer no criticism. I know that these statements were made in good faith and I am sure that that good faith will be vindicated by the vote we will take in a few minutes. At the time these statements were made they were thought to be true.

They will still be true if we adopt this motion to recommit. If we do not adopt it we will, I am sure, greatly embarrass some of our colleagues. I do not think the House wants to put the Members who made those statements in a false light.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield briefly.

Mr. LECOMPTE. In the agriculture appropriation bill which we passed a couple of weeks ago, we had an item for REA of \$400,000,000.

Mr. POAGE. We had a budget estimate of \$300,000,000 in connection with the regular appropriation bill. The committee raised that to \$400,000,000, which made an increase of \$100,000,000 in that item in the regular appropriation bill for the fiscal year of 1949. But at the same time, not after, but before we voted on that, we had a budget estimate of \$175,000,000 for a similar item for REA loans in the deficiency bill. The gentlemen will recall that back in February when the urgent deficiency bill was before this House I stated that I intended to ask for additional funds for REA when this bill was brought up. The gentleman from Mississippi actually offered an amendment to the first deficiency bill, which was defeated by only 20 votes. Everyone was on notice that REA was to seek more money in this bill. The budget sent its estimate for this deficiency item to the House before the regular bill was passed.

At the time the regular bill was passed the total budget request for the balance

of the 1948 fiscal year and for the fiscal year of 1949 totaled \$475,000,000. In the regular 1949 appropriation the House gave \$400,000,000. This lacked, and still lacks, \$75,000,000 of equalling the total amount requested by the budget. As this bill now stands it, taken together with the regular 1949 bill, would give \$475,000,000 for REA loans during the balance of the fiscal year of 1948 and during the fiscal year of 1949. That is exactly the total recommended by the budget. It is not the \$100,000,000 increase which many majority Members have said this House was giving. The only way we can provide that extra \$100,000,000 is to pass the motion to recommit.

Unless you adopt this motion to recommit you leave many of your colleagues in the position of having unintentionally deceived the country, of having misled the public. I know the majority Members of this House do not want to do that. If you want to keep faith with the public, and I know you do, if you want to make good on the claim that you have given the REA \$100,000,000 more than the budget recommended, then vote for this motion to recommit because it is the only way you can make those statements stand up. I want to see this House act fairly with the people. I know my Republican colleagues want to see the majority of this House keep faith with the people and do what we said we were going to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my constituents and myself, as well as for the citizens and taxpayers of other States, I wish to thank the committee chairman and members for the consideration given and the decisions reached in regard to the utilization of surplus farm and canned products in item "Government and relief in occupied areas" under the bill under consideration (H. R. 6055) and as established in colloquy between the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], who preceded me. We are satisfied that the mandate of the committee and of this Congress will now be carried out in respect to the purchase of the surplus farm and agricultural products stated in the hearings on this bill.

So there will be no further misunderstanding of this matter, I wish to quote from page 852 of the hearings a statement of the foods and the amounts of same that are agreed upon by the Army and directed to be utilized in this program by the committee, as follows:

Commodity	Total program per justification using nearest 1,000-ton figure	Procured or procurable with already appropriated funds	Shipments ¹ July 1, 1947, to Feb. 29, 1948	Expenditures, fiscal year 1948 funds only, from July 1, 1947, to Feb. 29, 1948 ²	Additional to be procured with funds now requested
GERMANY					
Bread grains and flour.....	3,226,000	Net long tons ³ 2,672,000	Net long tons ¹ 2,133,662		Net long tons 554,000
Fats and oils.....	116,000	116,000	35,546		0
Soya flour.....	101,000	101,000	8,163		0
Peas and beans.....	94,000	84,000	22,423		10,000
Sugar.....	520,000	351,000	134,738		169,000
Dried skim milk.....	45,000	45,000	34,841		0
Potatoes.....	190,000	190,000	103,839		0
Fish.....	180,000	180,000	46,695		0
Dried fruit.....	157,000	157,000	31,696		0
Dried eggs.....	8,350	8,350	0		0
Dried soup mixes.....	25,000	0	0		25,000
Canned sweetpotatoes.....	26,000	0	0		26,000
Miscellaneous foods.....	31,000	31,000	23,772		0
Total.....	4,719,350	3,935,350	2,575,375	\$207,216,276	784,000
JAPAN					
Bread grains and flour.....	1,123,000	631,000	1,779,011		192,000
Copra.....	37,000	37,000	19,600		0
Soybeans.....	58,000	58,000	7,565		0
Peas and beans.....	77,000	77,000	54,543		0
Soya flour.....	147,000	147,000	100,283		0
Soybean meal.....	41,000	41,000	0		0
Sugar.....	500,000	308,000	208,121		192,000
Dried skim milk.....	34,000	34,000	16,011		0
Dried prunes.....	20,411	20,411	9,679		0
Miscellaneous foods.....	15,266	15,266	29,506		0
Total.....	2,052,677	1,668,677	1,223,319	\$106,337,292	384,000
KOREA					
Bread grains and flour.....	235,000	205,000	1,168,060		30,000
Rice.....	50,000	50,000	12,586		0
Sugar.....	58,000	25,000	16,381		33,000
Soya flour.....	8,000	8,000	8,019		0
Total.....	351,000	288,000	205,046	\$9,715,007	63,000
Grand total.....	7,123,027	5,892,027	4,003,740	\$323,268,575	1,231,000

¹ Excludes July 1947 shipments of bread grains.

² These figures do not include either (1) the \$85,000,000 spent from fiscal year 1947 funds for foods constituting part of the fiscal year 1948 food program as set forth in the justifications; nor (2) the \$100,000,000 (approximate figure) of fiscal year 1947 funds expended for grain shipments during July 1947 which were treated as part of the fiscal year 1947 program.

³ Includes 57,000 tons Soviet grain not bought with appropriated funds.

⁴ Figures are estimates only.

Mr. Chairman, I am advised that under this specific item in the appropriation under discussion, and under the table hereinabove outlined that there is set aside the sum of \$2,437,000, for the purchase of canned sweetpotatoes, and I again state for the RECORD that I understand that it is the directive of the Committee and this Congress that a fair and reasonable price, as near as possible to the cost of production or processing shall be paid to our people by the Army for the canned sweetpotatoes, as well as all of the other agricultural products stated in the table presented.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my colleagues, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] and myself, who have worked with Mr. TABER and the Army officials in this matter, I wish to again thank Mr. TABER for the fine cooperation and assistance given in helping our people to include these foods in this program, and thereby save the loss of these fine and valuable foods, as well as making a contribution to the general economy of our country.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, unless there are some amendments to be offered I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CANNON. I am, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with an amendment as follows:

On page 10, line 7, strike out "\$300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$400,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 199, nays 154, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

YEAS—199

Abernethy	Gillette	Morrison
Albert	Gordon	Multer
Allen, La.	Gore	Mundt
Almond	Gorski	Murdoch
Andersen	Gossett	Murray, Tenn.
H. Carl	Gregory	Murray, Wis.
Angell	Griffiths	Norblad
Arnold	Hagen	Norton
Banta	Hardy	O'Konski
Barden	Harris	Pace
Barrett	Harrison	Patman
Bates, Ky.	Hart	Peden
Battle	Havener	Peterson
Beckworth	Hays	Philbin
Bennett, Mich.	Hedrick	Phillips, Tenn.
Bennett, Mo.	Hobbs	Pickett
Blatnik	Hoeben	Poage
Boggs, La.	Hollfield	Potter
Bonner	Hope	Powell
Brehm	Horan	Preston
Brooks	Huber	Price, Fla.
Brown, Ga.	Hull	Price, Ill.
Bryson	Isacson	Priest
Buchanan	Jackson, Wash.	Ramey
Bulwinkle	Jenkins, Ohio	Rankin
Burke	Johnson, Ind.	Rayburn
Burleson	Johnson, Okla.	Redden
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson, Tex.	Regan
Camp	Jones, Ala.	Rich
Cannon	Jones, N. C.	Riley
Carroll	Karsten, Mo.	Rivers
Carson	Kee	Robertson
Celler	Kefauver	Rogers, Fla.
Chelf	Kelley	Sadowski
Clark	Kennedy	Sasser
Cole, Mo.	Keogh	Schwabe, Mo.
Colmer	Kerr	Sheppard
Combs	Kilday	Short
Cooley	King	Simpson, Ill.
Cooper	Kirwan	Smathers
Courtney	Klein	Smith, Kans.
Cravens	Landis	Smith, Va.
Crosser	Lane	Smith, Wis.
Cunningham	Lanham	Somers
Curtis	Larcade	Spence
Davis, Ga.	Latham	Stanley
Davis, Tenn.	Lemke	Stefan
Davis, Wis.	Lucas	Stevenson
Deane	Lusk	Stigler
Dolliver	Lyle	Talle
Donohue	Lynch	Teague
Dorn	McCormack	Thomas, Tex.
Doughton	McCowan	Thompson
Douglas	McCulloch	Trimble
Durham	McGregor	Vinson
Eberhart	McMillan, S. C.	Vursell
Engle, Calif.	MacKinnon	Walter
Evins	Mahon	Wheeler
Feighan	Mansfield	Whitten
Fernandez	Marcantonio	Whittington
Fisher	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flannagan	Morrow	Wilson, Tex.
Fogarty	Meyer	Winstead
Folger	Miller, Calif.	Wood
Forand	Mills	Worley
Gary	Monroney	Zimmerman
Gathings	Morris	

NAYS—154

Allen, Calif.	Church	Fletcher
Anderson, Calif.	Clason	Foot
Andrews, N. Y.	Clevenger	Fuller
Arends	Corbett	Fulton
Auchincloss	Cotton	Gallagher
Bakewell	Coudert	Gamble
Bates, Mass.	Crawford	Gavin
Bishop	Crow	Gearhart
Boggs, Del.	Dague	Gillie
Bolton	Dawson, Utah	Goff
Bradley	Devitt	Goodwin
Bramblett	D'Ewart	Graham
Brophy	Dondero	Grant, Ind.
Brown, Ohio	Elliott	Gross
Butler	Ellis	Gwynn, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Ellsworth	Gwynne, Iowa
Canfield	Elsaesser	Hale
Chadwick	Elston	Hall
Chenoweth	Engel, Mich.	Edwin Arthur
Chipperfield	Fellows	Hall, Leonard W.
	Fenton	

Halleck	McGarvey	St. George
Hand	McMahon	Sanborn
Harvey	Mack	Sarbach
Herter	Maloney	Schwabe, Okla.
Heselton	Mathews	Scoblick
Hess	Michener	Scott
Hill	Miller, Conn.	Hugh D., Jr.
Hinsaw	Miller, Md.	Scribner
Holmes	Mitchell	Seely-Brown
Javits	Morton	Smith, Maine
Jenison	Muhlenberg	Smith, Ohio
Jensen	Nicholson	Snyder
Johnson, Calif.	Nixon	Stockman
Johnson, Ill.	Nodar	Taber
Jonkman	O'Brien	Tibbott
Judd	O'Hara	Tollefson
Kean	Patterson	Towe
Kearney	Phillips, Calif.	Twyman
Keating	Plumley	Vail
Keefe	Potts	Van Zandt
Kersten, Wis.	Poulson	Vorys
Kilburn	Reed, Ill.	Wadsworth
Knutson	Reed, N. Y.	Weichel
Kunkel	Rees	Welch
Lea	Reeves	Wigglesworth
LeCompte	Riehlman	Wilson, Ind.
LeFevre	Rockwell	Wolcott
Lewis	Rogers, Mass.	Wolverton
Lodge	Roughbough	Woodruff
McConnell	Ross	Youngblood
McDonough	Russell	
McDowell	Sadiak	

NOT VOTING—78

Abbott	Domeneaux	Mason
Allen, Ill.	Eaton	Meade, Ky.
Andersen	Fallon	Meade, Md.
August H.	Garmatz	Miller, Nebr.
Andrews, Ala.	Granger	Morgan
Beall	Grant, Ala.	Norrell
Bell	Harless, Ariz.	O'Toole
Bender	Harness, Ind.	Owens
Bland	Hartley	Passman
Bloom	Hébert	Pfeifer
Boykin	Heffernan	Ploeser
Buck	Hendricks	Rains
Buckley	Hoffman	Richards
Buffett	Jackson, Calif.	Rizley
Busbey	Jarman	Rooney
Case, N. J.	Jenkins, Pa.	Sabath
Case, S. Dak.	Jennings	Scott, Hardie
Chapman	Jones, Wash.	Shafer
Clippinger	Kearns	Sikes
Coffin	Lesinski	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, Kans.	Lichtenwalter	Stratton
Cole, N. Y.	Love	Sundstrom
Cox	Ludlow	Taylor
Dawson, Ill.	McMillen, Ill.	Thomas, N. J.
Delaney	Macy	West
Dingell	Madden	
Dirksen	Manasco	

So the bill was recommitted.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Andrews of Alabama for, with Mr. Hardie Scott against.

Mr. Chapman for, with Mr. Buck against.

Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Sundstrom against.

Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Lichtenwalter against.

Mr. Passman for, with Mr. Kearns against.

Mr. Richards for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Hendricks for, with Mr. Case of New Jersey against.

Mr. Cox for, with Mr. Macy against.

Mr. Abbott for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. West with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Beall.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Buffett.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Clippinger.

Mr. Bloom with Mr. Coffin.

Mr. Dawson of Illinois with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Bland with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.

Mr. Grant of Alabama with Mr. Meade of Kentucky.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Love.

Mr. Domeneaux with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Rooney with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Sabath with Mr. Jones of Washington.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Busbey.

Mr. Granger with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Cole of Kansas.

Mr. Manasco with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Ludlow with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.

Mr. Norrell with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Harless of Arizona with Mr. Stratton.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Shafer.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Rizley.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Ploeser.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Owens.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Bender.

Mr. MICHENER, Mr. ELLIS, and Mr. BRADLEY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. CARSON changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the instructions of the House, I report the bill back with an amendment which is at the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 7, strike out "\$300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$400,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 339, nays 4, not voting 88, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

YEAS—339

Abernethy	Carson	Fellows
Albert	Case, S. Dak.	Fenton
Allen, Calif.	Celler	Fernandez
Allen, La.	Chadwick	Fisher
Almond	Chelf	Flannagan
Andersen	Chenoweth	Fletcher
H. Carl	Chipperfield	Fogarty
Anderson, Calif.	Church	Folger
Andrews, N. Y.	Clark	Foot
Angell	Clason	Forand
Arends	Clevenger	Fuller
Arnold	Cole, Mo.	Fulton
Auchincloss	Colmer	Gamble
Bakewell	Combs	Gary
Banta	Cooley	Gathings
Barden	Cooper	Gearhart
Barrett	Corbett	Gillette
Bates, Ky.	Cotton	Gillie
Bates, Mass.	Coudert	Goff
Battle	Courtney	Goodwin
Beckworth	Cravens	Gordon
Bennett, Mich.	Crawford	Gorski
Bennett, Mo.	Crosser	Gossett
Bishop	Crow	Graham
Blackney	Cunningham	Grant, Ind.
Blatnik	Curtis	Gregory
Boggs, Del.	Dague	Griffiths
Boggs, La.	Davis, Ga.	Gwynn, N. Y.
Bolton	Davis, Wis.	Gwynne, Iowa
Bonner	Dawson, Utah	Hagen
Bradley	Deane	Hale
Bramblett	Devitt	Hall
Brehm	D'Ewart	Edwin Arthur
Brooks	Dolliver	Hall, Leonard W.
Brophy	Dondero	Halleck
Brown, Ga.	Donohue	Hand
Brown, Ohio	Dorn	Hardy
Bryson	Doughton	Harless, Ariz.
Buchanan	Douglas	Harris
Bulwinkle	Durham	Harrison
Burke	Eberhart	Hart
Burleson	Elliott	Harvey
Butler	Ellis	Havener
Byrne, N. Y.	Ellsworth	Hays
Byrnes, Wis.	Elsaesser	Hedrick
Camp	Elston	Herter
Canfield	Engel, Mich.	
Cannon	Feighan	

Heselton	McMillan, S. C.	Rogers, Mass.
Hill	Mack	Rohrbough
Hinshaw	MacKinnon	Ross
Hobbs	Mahon	Russell
Hoeven	Maloney	Sadlak
Hollifield	Mansfield	Sadowski
Holmes	Marcantonio	Sanborn
Hope	Martin, Iowa	Sarbacher
Horan	Mathews	Sasser
Huber	Merrow	Schwabe, Mo.
Hull	Meyer	Schwabe, Okla.
Isacson	Michener	Scoblick
Jackson, Wash.	Miller, Calif.	Scott
Javits	Miller, Md.	Hugh D., Jr.
Jenison	Mills	Sclryner
Jenkins, Ohio	Mitchell	Seely-Brown
Jensen	Monroney	Sheppard
Johnson, Calif.	Morris	Short
Johnson, Ill.	Morrison	Simpson, Ill.
Johnson, Ind.	Morton	Simpson, Pa.
Johnson, Okla.	Muhlenberg	Smathers
Johnson, Tex.	Multer	Smith, Kans.
Jones, Ala.	Mundt	Smith, Maine
Jones, N. C.	Murdoch	Smith, Va.
Jonkman	Murray, Tenn.	Smith, Wis.
Judd	Murray, Wis.	Snyder
Karsten, Mo.	Nicholson	Somers
Kean	Nixon	Spence
Kearney	Nodar	Stanley
Keating	Norton	Stefan
Kee	O'Brien	Stevenson
Keefe	O'Hara	Stigler
Kefauver	O'Konski	Stockman
Kelley	Pace	Taber
Kennedy	Patman	Talle
Keogh	Patterson	Teague
Kerr	Peden	Thomas, Tex.
Kersten, Wis.	Peterson	Thompson
Kilday	Phillips, Calif.	Tibbott
King	Phillips, Tenn.	Tollefson
Kirwan	Pickett	Trimble
Klein	Ploeser	Twyman
Knutson	Plumley	Vall
Kunkel	Poage	Van Zandt
Landis	Potter	Vorys
Lane	Potts	Vursell
Lanham	Poulson	Wadsworth
Larcade	Powell	Walter
Lea	Preston	Welch
LeCompte	Price, Fla.	Wheeler
LeFevre	Price, Ill.	Whitten
Lemke	Ramey	Whittington
Lewis	Rankin	Wigglesworth
Lodge	Rayburn	Williams
Lucas	Redden	Wilson, Ind.
Lusk	Reed, Ill.	Wilson, Tex.
Lyle	Reed, N. Y.	Winstead
Lynch	Rees	Wolcott
McConnell	Reeves	Wolverton
McCormack	Regan	Wood
McCowan	Riehlman	Woodruff
McCulloch	Riley	Worley
McDonough	Rivers	Youngblood
McDowell	Robertson	Zimmerman
McGarvey	Rockwell	
McGregor	Rogers, Fla.	
McMahon		

NAYS—4

Gross	Miller, Conn.	Towe
Kilburn		

NOT VOTING—88

Abbott	Engle, Calif.	Mason
Allen, Ill.	Evins	Meade, Ky.
Andresen	Fallon	Meade, Md.
August H.	Gallagher	Miller, Nebr.
Andrews, Ala.	Garmatz	Morgan
Beall	Gore	Norblad
Bell	Granger	Norrell
Bender	Grant, Ala.	O'Toole
Bland	Harness, Ind.	Owens
Bloom	Hartley	Passman
Boykin	Hébert	Pfeifer
Buck	Heffernan	Priest
Buckley	Hendricks	Rains
Buffett	Hess	Rich
Busbey	Hoffman	Richards
Carroll	Jackson, Calif.	Rizley
Case, N. J.	Jarman	Rooney
Chapman	Jenkins, Pa.	Sabath
Clippinger	Jennings	St. George
Coffin	Jones, Wash.	Scott, Hardie
Cole, Kans.	Kearns	Shafer
Cole, N. Y.	Latham	Sikes
Cox	Lesinski	Smith, Ohio
Davis, Tenn.	Lichtenwalter	Stratton
Dawson, Ill.	Love	Sundstrom
Delaney	Ludlow	Taylor
Dingell	McMillen, Ill.	Thomas, N. J.
Dirksen	Macy	Vinson
Domengeaux	Madden	West
Eaton	Manasco	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Allen of Illinois.	Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Hardie Scott.	Mr. Gore with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Busbey.	Mr. Evins with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
Mr. Abbott with Mr. Gallagher.	Mr. Cox with Mr. Clippinger.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Lichtenwalter.	Mr. Chapman with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Grant of Alabama with Mr. Rich.	Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Priest with Mr. Case of New Jersey.	Mr. Carroll with Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Cole of Kansas.	Mr. Boykin with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Dirksen.	Mr. Manasco with Mr. Macy.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Eaton.	Mr. Norrell with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Meade of Kentucky.	Mr. Fallon with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.	
Mr. Rains with Mr. Love.	
Mr. West with Mr. Kearns.	
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Jones of Washington.	

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVERY COUNTRY BUT OUR OWN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, by an overwhelming vote, the House decided to extend aid to foreign governments for the purpose, it was said, of stopping communism and preventing our own destruction by Stalin and the Russians.

Years ago, a fighting American announced that this Government of ours had billions for defense but not 1 cent for tribute.

But confidence in constitutional government, in the ability, courage, and endurance of our own people seems to be long to the horse and buggy days.

The program adopted yesterday, whether the people know it or not, is unlimited as to amount or time. The debate in the Senate and in the House shows conclusively that \$17,000,000,000 is not the total that will be asked and, unless the people halt it, given. A distinguished Member of the Senate, a proponent of the plan, during the debate stated that, with the passage of the bill, this country was morally obligated to following through. He did not say for how long. Nor does the plan end with the gift of money and supplies. Already we have sent military men as advisers to Greece and Turkey—doubtless to other countries.

Our gifts of money and materials, some of which are going to governments which will shortly turn at least a portion of them over to our potential enemy, Russia, and our military men will be followed by our Air Force, Navy, and Army unless the people call a halt.

Those supporting this plan do not tell us that it will avoid war. The most they will predict is that it may avoid war—that it is a calculated risk.

Having listened to the debates in both House and Senate just prior to World War II, my conclusion is that we are to-

day following the same road we followed then. You will undoubtedly recall that the Congress made many appropriations, extended aid in many ways, to Great Britain in order to avoid war. You have not forgotten that Churchill told us that, if we would give Great Britain the tools, she would do the job.

Nor have you forgotten—at least you should not have forgotten—that when we went into the war he made the statement in substance and to the effect that that was the day he had been hoping and praying for.

We let ourselves be led into World War II. If we follow the administration and the propagandists, the passage of this Marshall plan will lead us into another war.

War is not inevitable if we choose to avoid it. Stalin is not going to come to America to fight a war.

Beyond question he intends to take over those countries which border on his own land. In my judgment, he is taking the things which Roosevelt and Churchill promised he should have. To date, the American public has not been able to learn how much nor what Roosevelt and Churchill conceded to Stalin in their various conferences. Nor does anyone know what concessions Truman made. The American people are entitled to a transcript of all the conversations and agreements entered into by Stalin on the one side and either Roosevelt, Churchill, or Truman on the other.

Already, under the authority granted by the unification bill, which was forced through our committee by our leaders and into which I endeavored to write some safeguards, the military are taking over and regimentering our natural resources and our industries.

Nor is that all. The next step is the bill for compulsory universal military training. It is proposed to establish here in America the same system used by Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini, and which failed when put to the test.

Compulsory military training will be followed by a drive to conscript the young men and probably the young women of this land to fight another war.

With the war will come again scarcity, high prices, price fixing, and regimentation.

In short, to sum it all up, the proposition is that we force Stalin to get out of those countries which are adjacent to Russia, that we give those countries, and all others throughout the world, what some are pleased to describe as democracy—which, let us assume, they mean is equivalent to the freedom of action which we have here. We bleed ourselves white, we crack wide open our national defense in a futile effort to extend democracy abroad, and in return we get here at home price fixing, rationing, which adds up to regimentation which always means a dictator.

Without a war scare, Truman has no hope of reelection.

Without a war scare, those in the military service will be unable to destroy individual freedom, the American way of living and doing business.

Not so long ago the question in many minds was whether, following the New

Deal, we would have a labor or a military government. At the moment, it seems as though labor were losing, the military gaining, control.

The American people were twice, by ambitious politicians, led into war and 100 years of work and thrift by taxpaying Americans will not cancel the monetary cost.

The moral and spiritual loss caused by these two wars, and by those who were responsible for them, will darken the lives of future generations for—no one knows how long.

From the Chicago Tribune of March 31 comes an editorial captioned, "Later than you think," which reads as follows:

LATER THAN YOU THINK

The newspaper headlines, the radio babble, the urgent, solemn, and sometimes rather frantic statements of leaders, are all suggestive of 1941. There is an ominous parallel in demands for the immediate build-up of vast military force, with the assurance that, of course, this power is to enforce a will for peace, not to get the United States into war. That is what we were told last time.

Every prudent instinct warns that this is a maneuvered crisis. The Tribune has seen it coming for a long time. Almost alone among the newspapers of the country we warned of the rise of a dangerous militarist party in America when the so-called service unification bill, with all of its totalitarian apparatus, was thrust on Congress last year as must legislation.

We saw the lines of conflict being drawn for another war even before that when Mr. Truman enunciated his doctrine of stopping Russia at the borders of Greece and Turkey. Two world wars had convinced us of the tragic folly of trying to order the world to our design through use of force at ruinous moral and material expense. Crusades against tyranny abroad have only brought totalitarianism closer at home. We can't cheer another one when, once more, our security is not jeopardized by distant events.

It seems plain that this rigged crisis grows out of Truman's political desperation. He has become the captive of the powerful militaristic faction in his administration. The assertion of a foreign menace is necessary to provide them with the men, the money, the weapons, and the dominance over the Nation that they seek. It will also enhance his prestige by giving him the opportunity to play the strong man in resisting world communism, as convenient a bete noire as Hitlerism was for his predecessor. He has lost political control at home; there is a long chance that he can recapture it by military adventurism abroad.

This policy has its accustomed charm to the same internationalist elements which whipped up the war fever of 1940-41 by playing on the Nation's fears. The propaganda mechanisms of that period are being dusted off again. Although nothing developed out of World War II, according to the prophecies of these alarmists, they are back unabashed, telling us once more what we should do.

There are the same voices, the same scares, the same arguments. Here is Joseph C. Grew, Roosevelt's Ambassador to Japan, saying, "We cannot afford to face some future day when America will stand alone." We were told that in 1941. Here is Mrs. Roosevelt, saying that it is "inconsistent to cut taxes" because "the preparation on which we and other democratic nations are now embarked will be financed completely by the United States." These are echoes from the past: lend-lease all over again and our friends, the "peace-loving democracies," among which Mrs. Roosevelt used to reckon the present presumptive adversary.

XCIV—252

Here is Dr. Isaiah Bowman, president of Johns Hopkins University and an architect of the United Nations, proclaiming: "This is not a time of peace. . . . What mountains of evidence must yet be piled up before the people of the United States realize that we are even now at war?" So the war is not ahead of us. It is here now.

A President and a war party that start playing the dangerous game of seeking political advantage and power in a threat of war will find in the outcome that they have carried their countrymen into irretrievable conflict. Step by step, a little at a time, they advance. Once started, they can't turn back.

The militarists know where they are headed. Truman may know. To the people, bewildered by the drumfire of propaganda and rendered victim to secret maneuvering, it is a confusing mystery. The Pearl Harbor investigation disclosed the technique after the last war was over. Are we in for another future inquest, showing again how the executive branch of the Government betrayed the people into war? We are, unless the people and Congress apprehend this sinister pattern in time. It should be familiar to them by now.

Truly it is later than you think, but the people of America still have one opportunity to rescue their Government from the politically ambitious, the over-fearful, the screwy thinking, the do-gooders who never seem to learn nor to accept realities. Unless next November the people elect a President who believes in our form of government, who has faith in the ability and courage of our people, we will be in a world war.

I am fearful that unless, before that election, Senators and Congressmen hear from their home folks, those Senators and Congressmen will so far commit us into the hands of the ambitious war-minded leaders of Europe and Asia that it will be impossible to avoid war. If the home folks do not want scarcities and all that scarcities mean; if they do not want bureaucratic price fixing and rationing; if they do not want a horde of little dictators telling them every day what to eat, what to wear, and what to do, they should without delay make their wishes known to their chosen representatives in Congress.

Yesterday there was hoisted over the Capitol in Washington the red flag of danger and the yellow flag of fear—the first, without reason, the second, without justification.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an analysis of the tax bill which will probably be before us tomorrow. I have analyzed the bill in question-and-answer form for the use of the membership of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. MARCANTONIO) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include newspaper articles.

LEASING OF STATE LANDS FOR PRODUCTION OF OIL, GAS, AND OTHER HYDROCARBONS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4167) to authorize the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Washington to lease their State lands for the production of oil, gas, and other hydrocarbons for such terms of years and on such conditions as may be from time to time provided by the legislative assembly of the respective States, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 6, strike out all after "amended" where it appears the second time down to and including "States," in line 12 and insert "to read as follows: 'Except as otherwise provided herein, the said lands may be leased under such regulations as the legislature may prescribe. Leases for the production of minerals, including leases for exploration for oil, gas, and other hydrocarbons and the extraction thereof, shall be for such term of years and on such conditions as may be from time to time provided by the legislatures of the respective States; leases for grazing and agricultural purposes shall be for a term not longer than 10 years; and leases for development of hydroelectric power shall be for a term not longer than 50 years.'"

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Washington to lease their State lands for production of minerals, including leases for exploration for oil, gas, and other hydrocarbons and the extraction thereof, for such terms of years and on such conditions as may be from time to time provided by the legislatures of the respective States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the Record in the deficiency appropriation bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] be permitted to revise and extend his remarks and insert a statement in regard to the history of Missouri, despite the fact that it will require an additional page in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his re-

marks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. Harley J. Credicott, of Freeport, Ill.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] is recognized for 45 minutes.

FLOODS ON THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour I will make my remarks very brief. I do want, however, to point out that I intend to take 45 minutes sometime next week because I desire to cover a subject which is of the utmost importance to my own district. It has to do with the flooding of the Susquehanna River, which last week overflowed its banks and caused death and disaster to the western part of Broome County in the vicinity of Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, N. Y. It is my objective to talk on the bill which I am introducing today which will call upon Congress in this emergency to authorize \$1,000,000 for the start of the building of flood walls on each side of the Susquehanna River in the Endicott-Johnson City-Vestal area.

I hope the House will give sympathetic attention to this grave matter because, as I have said, it has resulted in death and destruction to the extent of about half a million dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next and on Thursday next I may on each date address the House for 45 minutes following the disposition of the business of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is recognized for 20 minutes.

A BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, international relations are deteriorating at an amazing and an alarming rate. The Soviet Union is pushing a program of brazen, sinister, and ruthless expansion. The Kremlin, by its philosophy and by its actions, is clearly demonstrating that world domination is the ultimate Russian objective.

The interests of the United States are global. Our security and our survival are at stake. It is imperative for us to state our foreign policy concisely, clearly, and firmly so that there can be no misunderstanding as to our determination to establish a decent society and to guarantee world peace.

Failure to clearly set forth our position before the outbreak of two world wars resulted in a most costly experience for the United States. Failure to prepare ourselves adequately for any international emergency and failure to realize that any future war in which we may be involved will cost us dearly in

material resources and human lives. By being utterly realistic in facing present disturbing world conditions we will be able to take the steps necessary to avert a third world war.

THE NATIONAL CONVENTIONS

In June and July the Republicans and the Democrats will hold their national conventions. They will write platforms and nominate candidates for the Presidency. In this uncertain, complex, and strife-ridden world international issues are becoming of increasing significance to every American citizen. It would be most salutary, most effective, most beneficial, and most heartening to the American people if the conventions would adopt an identical bipartisan foreign policy platform. It would be an announcement that the United States faces the world with a solid united front. It would be clearly understood that we intend to approach international issues in bipartisan unity and not in partisan dissension. A realistic bipartisan platform on foreign policy should include planks incorporating the following principles:

PROPOSED PRINCIPLES FOR PLANKS IN A BIPARTISAN PLATFORM ON FOREIGN POLICY

First. The United States should firmly dedicate itself and all its resources to the maintenance of its destiny-given position of leadership for world peace. This Republic was brought into being for the prime purpose of laying the foundations for a just and permanent peace. Every American heart must be devoted to the achievement of this objective. All the energy, all the ability, and all the statesmanship we possess must be employed for the realization of this goal.

Second. Congress should appoint immediately a select committee to conduct a thorough study of international relations and to carry out a searching investigation of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. Such procedure would give the Members of Congress a more potent voice in the development and in the implementation of foreign policy.

Third. The United States must continue to exercise leadership in the establishment of a real, workable, and effective world organization. The defects of the UN, chief of which is the veto, must be removed. If this cannot be accomplished and if the Kremlin continues in its refusal to cooperate, we must abandon the UN and form at once a new international organization of liberty-loving democratic states without the presence of the impending Soviet Union.

Fourth. Diplomatic appeasement of the Soviet Union in which we have been indulging since the end of the war must cease. Diplomatic appeasement failed in the 1930's. It has failed in the 1940's. It leads only to conflict.

Fifth. Economic assistance to rehabilitate the economies of countries resisting the spread of communism and the drive of Russian aggression must be continued by the United States. An admirable beginning has been made in the passage of ERP. As long as aid to free nations is effective in checking the advance of the Soviet Union and in preventing the spread of communism, we must continue whether it be for 1, 4, 5, or 10 years.

In extending aid, we should constantly demand that the nations who receive assistance help themselves. As soon as they are self-supporting, have successfully liquidated the sinister spread of communism and strengthened themselves militarily, our aid can be greatly diminished or entirely ceased. We help guarantee our security by strengthening those who are resisting the march of Mr. Stalin and his politbureau.

Sixth. If a democratic country, threatened by a Communist minority within, which is either directly or indirectly aided, abetted, and controlled by the Kremlin, asks aid of the United States, assistance should be extended, be it economic or military.

Seventh. The United States should inform the world and particularly the Soviet Union that we intend to use our force to stop aggression directed at strategic points such as the approaches to the Atlantic, Gibraltar, the countries of western Europe, the Dardanelles, Greece, Turkey, Iran, the Near East, the Persian Gulf area, China, and the islands of the Pacific. We should state clearly that whenever there is encroachment on these areas, or any other strategic positions, the integrity of which we deem essential to the security and the survival of the United States, the power making such an encroachment will meet with our immediate, sustained, and unrelenting resistance. We should for our own self-interest and the peace of the world establish a line beyond which an aggressor may not move without encountering the full force and power of the United States.

Eighth. Most important of all planks in a realistic, bipartisan program on foreign policy is the achievement and the maintenance of adequate preparedness on the sea, on the land, and more especially in the air. Atomic supremacy and air supremacy by the United States must be realized at all costs.

United States air supremacy is the only road to world peace. All the funds required to keep us the strongest military nation on the planet should be unhesitatingly appropriated by the Congress. Having done this, the Congress should insist that the armed services efficiently and effectively move to an early and full realization of this determined objective.

Legislation to provide full and adequate manpower for the armed services should be enacted at once.

WAR OR PEACE

I am convinced that the proposed principles on United States foreign policy which I have outlined should be adopted as a program by both parties at their conventions in June and July and should be incorporated in their platforms.

A weak foreign policy, an unrealistic foreign policy, a fragmentary foreign policy, a vacillating foreign policy, a foreign policy of appeasement will lead us only to destruction, to war, to slavery, and to death.

A strong foreign policy, a resolute foreign policy, a firm foreign policy, a realistic foreign policy, a foreign policy dedicated to world freedom backed by the armed might of the United States

will guarantee a free world, a peaceful world, a world in which nations can live without fear of intimidation, of aggression, of slavery, and of ultimate annihilation.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

EDWARD U. CONDON

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, despite the lateness of the hour, the Committee on Un-American Activities has a matter it has thought wise to bring before the House. We have carefully waited until the European recovery plan was disposed of. We feel now, however, that the matter should be discussed.

On March 1 of this year a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities issued a statement in which was named the Director of the Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce, Edward U. Condon. A member of that subcommittee, the very able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL] has prepared a statement that I feel the House will be greatly interested in hearing. I therefore yield at this point such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL].

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, throughout recent weeks the Committee on Un-American Activities has been the target of continuous vicious attacks by various organizations and individuals as well as by certain Members of this body, few in number, it is true, but blatantly vocal and chronically unsympathetic to the aims and objectives of the committee and as chronically blind to its accomplishments.

The very nature of the assignment entrusted to the committee to keep the Congress informed of subversive activities affecting the security of our country is sufficient of itself to draw the fire of those whose interests lie in establishing and maintaining a curtain of secrecy concealing the movements of organizations and individuals who seek to destroy our Government—a curtain that has been thrown aside times without number by the committee and its investigators, permitting the scorching glare of publicity to sear and wither the well-laid plans of our enemies.

It is the penalty of service on the committee to be reviled and blasphemed by persons and groups sympathetic to the aims of the Soviet Union, by so-called Liberals and by weaklings who have been influenced by communistic propaganda. That penalty we accept in good grace in the knowledge that were we less effective we would not be so cordially hated by those elements.

It is my very great honor to be a member of your Committee on Un-American Activities, and I have a keen appreciation of the important responsibilities that such a membership entails. I was and I am deeply gratified by my appointment to that committee since selection to serve thereon implied the confidence of our leadership in my judgment, general capacity, and patriotism.

I am now serving my second year and I have come to know well my associates on that committee and I have conceived

a very great measure of respect for each of them and all of them, Republican and Democrat alike, for the intensity of their devotion to their country, for their high intelligence, for the wisdom of their decisions, for their temperate self-control in the face of epithet and insult hurled from the witness chair, and for the uniformly wholehearted cooperation and the fine esprit de corps that has characterized the committee throughout my period of service.

We have been described as bug-eyed witch hunters, vilified and excoriated as intent upon destruction of individual liberties, but I submit to you that, on the contrary, the members of the committee individually and collectively are conservative, conscientious, and possessed of a rare degree of calm, deliberate judgment and common sense, and their unceasing efforts are concentrated upon the preservation of every right guaranteed to American citizens under the Constitution.

Its members have been accused of using the committee as a springboard to publicity. Let me point out that considering its potentiality for press interest the committee has been exceptionally reserved and the majority of its members are rarely quoted or even mentioned in the press in connection with committee activities.

Your committee has been patient and tolerant of unfair criticisms from the floor in the light of their sources and in the knowledge that complete vindication of its acts awaited only the opportunity for formal presentation of the evidence in its possession.

It should not be necessary to defend the committee or its actions since the past record reflects the fact that the committee has without exception been sustained in its findings by preponderant vote of the House and subsequently by court decisions.

It would seem in the light of these facts that the committee has earned your confidence—at least to the extent that judgment be withheld until the full facts are made known in public hearing.

However, we take the floor today, departing from precedent, because there appears to be some question in the minds of Members who have consistently indicated their confidence in the committee as to whether or not, at long last, the committee has for once moved too hastily with respect to the release concerning Dr. Edward U. Condon. We appreciate that limited knowledge of the facts makes it difficult for such Members to adequately reply to critics from their districts in the period intervening before the hearing is held. Hence this statement.

First, let me point out that when the Committee on Un-American Activities levels a charge against any individual or organization the reputation of that individual or organization is not alone involved. The reputations of each committee member and of the committee itself hang in the balance, and if our charges are not fully substantiated, we would be discredited as individuals and as a committee, a fate we would richly deserve.

With that frequently accepted risk in mind and with a natural repugnance toward publicizing the shortcomings of any person, but with a deep sense of our obligation to protect our national security, our subcommittee met for consideration of the Condon case.

Dr. Edward U. Condon is Director of the National Bureau of Standards, which acts as custodian of the Nation's basic scientific standards and is one of the most important national-defense research organizations in the United States. It is engaged in projects at the present time concerning atomic energy, radar proximity fuses, instrument-landing systems, jet fuels, and other vital and secret projects that affect the security of our Nation. The Director of this agency has access to the confidential records not only of the atomic bomb but to other information that constitutes the objective of the prying activities of every Soviet espionage agent in the United States.

Dr. Condon was recommended to the vital post he now holds on November 5, 1945, by Henry Wallace, who was then Secretary of Commerce. In submitting his name, Mr. Wallace bypassed the visiting committee of three, who ordinarily pass upon the appointment of the Director of the Bureau of Standards, and when Mr. Wallace was challenged by a member of the committee he stated he did not know it was customary.

Dr. Condon, while with the Manhattan project, wrote a letter to his superior registering his impatience with the security regulations set up to protect the secret of atomic energy.

Dr. Condon is a member of the executive committee of the American-Soviet Science Society which is affiliated with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., an organization cited several years ago as a Communist front by the Committee on Un-American Activities and recently also cited as such by the Attorney General of the United States. His name, as a suggester of potential members is used by the organization in recruiting to its ranks scientists employed by the Bureau of Standards—successfully in at least 10 instances.

A member of Dr. Condon's immediate family is a member of an organization cited by the Attorney General as a Communist front and is active in another organization similarly designated by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Dr. Condon has frequently associated with diplomatic representatives of the Russian, Polish, and Czechoslovak Governments. He has been entertained at the homes of diplomatic representatives of the Bulgarian Government. It is a well-known fact that all of these governments are controlled by the communistic leaders of Soviet Russia. Dr. Condon has entertained diplomatic representatives of the Russian, Czechoslovakian and Bulgarian Governments in a home that has been supplied to him by the Government of the United States.

Dr. Condon has been associated with persons known to be subjects of investigation for espionage activity. He has associated with numerous persons who in turn have associated themselves with

known agents of the Soviet Government. He has been associated with an individual who was considered such a security risk that he could not obtain a passport to leave the United States. This person was discharged from the United States Government service because he was considered so pro-Russian that he could not be trusted to guard certain files of the United States Government against Russian encroachment.

Dr. Condon has also been associated with an individual who was dismissed from a non-Government agency because of his Communist tendencies. The identities of all of the persons to whom I have referred will be disclosed at the forthcoming hearing. However, the instances that I have cited should be sufficient to establish the character of the people with whom Dr. Condon has elected to associate himself.

It is conceivable that a person might associate with one or two individuals and have no knowledge of their Communist affiliations. However, when a person having access to vital information relating to atomic energy associates with 30 or more individuals, whether directly or indirectly, who are engaging not only in the dissemination of communistic doctrine, but who are engaged in espionage activity on behalf of the Soviet Russian Government, such association becomes a matter of national concern.

Dr. Condon has made a number of speeches indicating an interest in Russia, one of which was made on the occasion of the Fifth Annual Science Institute on March 5, 1946, in Washington, D. C., from which I quote. Condon, speaking of Russia, said:

We must welcome their scientists to our laboratories, as they have welcomed us to theirs, and extend the base of scientific co-operation with this great people. Of course, we must behave this way toward the scientists of all nations. I only mention Russia because she is right now the target of attack by those irresponsibles who think she would be a suitable adversary in the next world war.

In the same address Condon made the statement:

We must regain for all scientists that freedom from military domination if science is to be used for peaceful ends.

Condon's belief in the free exchange of information among world scientists is indicated by the following quotation from his article *Is War Research Science?* which appeared in the *Saturday Review of Literature* of January 15, 1945:

The restoration of freedom to science is one of the elements in the civilization we have been fighting for—freedom from secrecy and freedom from national barriers.

So serious have Dr. Condon's associations been that on May 15, 1947, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, sent a confidential letter on the subject to W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce. Our investigator was able to copy hastily only part of the contents of Mr. Hoover's letter, which was 3½ pages long. That part which we believe to be essentially accurate we quote as follows:

The files of the Bureau reflect that Dr. Edward U. Condon has been in contact as

late as 1947 with an individual alleged by a self-confessed Soviet espionage agent to have engaged in espionage activities with the Russians in Washington, D. C., from 1941 to 1944.

Mr. and Mrs. Condon associated with several individuals connected with the Polish Embassy in Washington, D. C. Among those are Mrs. Joseph Winiewicz, wife of the Polish Ambassador, Virginia Woerk, a clerk employee of the Polish Embassy; Helen M. Harris, secretary of the Polish Embassy, and Ignace Zlotowski, former counselor of the Polish Embassy and presently a Polish delegate to the United Nations.

Helen Harris is identified as a former secretary to the American-Soviet Science Society during the time it was known as science committee of the National American-Soviet Friendship Society. She went to work for the Polish Embassy in the fall of 1946.

Zlotowski is identified as a nuclear scientist who studied under Joliet Curie, known member of the Communist Party. He was ex-secretary of the American-Soviet Society. It is known that in February 1947 Zlotowski purchased 270 books on atomic energy which had been published by the Department of Commerce.

It is also known that Mr. and Mrs. Condon were in contact with several other persons closely associated with this alleged Soviet espionage agent. It is also reliably reported that in March 1947 Zlotowski offered the use of the Polish diplomatic pouch to scientific groups as a means of transmitting scientific material outside the United States, dissemination of which had to be restricted because of security reasons by military authorities.

Zlotowski was in contact with Anatole Cromov, first secretary of the Soviet Embassy, who has since returned to Russia. Condon applied for passport June 4, 1946, to Russia, which was issued but was later canceled by the Army.

I do not deem it proper to disclose at this time the full facts upon which the committee acted, since hearings are scheduled for April 21, when the entire compilation will be introduced in evidence. I feel that sufficient material has been presented in this statement to enable you to reach the conclusion to which the committee arrived, namely, that it is the unanimous opinion of the subcommittee that Dr. Condon should either be removed or a statement should be forthcoming from the Secretary of Commerce setting forth the reasons why he has retained Dr. Condon in view of the derogatory information he has had before him.

Since the issuance of our report there has been a hue and cry from certain quarters that our committee was intimidating American scientists and as a result retarding scientific development. When the safety of our Nation is involved, so far as our committee is concerned, no individual or class of individuals enjoy any immunity from exposure, a scientist is accorded the same treatment as the butcher, baker, or candlestick maker.

It is the belief of our committee that Government service is a privilege and not a right, and that an individual who occupies the position of Director of the Bureau of Standards and acts as the custodian of scientific standards and developments, having under his direction projects dealing with secret scientific data vital to our national existence should not hold membership in an organization authoritatively declared to be subversive nor should he cultivate asso-

ciation with card-carrying Communists, and that also holds true of the members of his household.

Because we dared to call attention to Dr. Condon's dangerous associations and affiliations, we have been charged with retarding science.

Was J. Edgar Hoover retarding science when he wrote a three and one-half page letter to the Secretary of Commerce, in which he detailed Dr. Condon's associations?

Was Gen. Leslie Groves, Director of the Manhattan project, retarding science when he had Dr. Condon taken off a Soviet-bound plane in 1945, and refused to permit him to go to Russia, notwithstanding authorization of the trip by the State Department?

We grant that science may have been retarded by the arrest, conviction, and imprisonment for 10 years of Alan Munn May, professor of nuclear physics at Cambridge University, who was found guilty of the charge that he was a Soviet spy. His is not an isolated case—other scientists are serving sentences in Canadian prisons for the same offense.

Let me recapitulate the events that followed release of the report of the subcommittee that occurred at 4 p. m. on March 1. Several hours later, Under Secretary of Commerce William C. Foster, issued a public statement to the effect that Dr. Condon had been unanimously cleared by the Department of Commerce Loyalty Board on February 24, 1948, 6 days before the issuance of the report.

On March 3, the Committee on Un-American Activities served a subpoena upon Mr. John L. Towne, secretary of the Loyalty Board of the Department of Commerce, calling upon him to appear before the committee and to bring with him the letter of May 15, 1947, from J. Edgar Hoover, to W. Averell Harriman, together with all records and files pertaining to Dr. Edward U. Condon. Mr. Towne appeared before the Committee and submitted a letter from the Secretary of Commerce Harriman, in which the Secretary said:

I have after careful consideration reached the conclusion that the release of the documents and information called for in this case would, in fact, be prejudicial to the public interest.

He further stated:

I have instructed the Secretary of the Loyalty Board of this Department to appear in response to the subpoena which you have caused to be served upon him and to report to you that he is not authorized or empowered to produce the papers in question. I have further instructed him, in view of the considerations mentioned above, including the importance of avoiding any action which might prejudice the review of the case by the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission, respectfully to decline to testify concerning the subject matter of the subpoena.

The members of the Committee on Un-American Activities feel that it was in the public interest that the entire text of Mr. Hoover's letter be made public. The gentleman from California [Mr. Nixon], a member of our committee, sent telegrams to the Attorney General and to Mr. Harriman, requesting them to make public Mr. Hoover's letter.

They declined to do so. Another member of our committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], called upon President Truman to instruct the Secretary of Commerce to make the letter public. Now I submit, why would they not make the full text of this letter public? It does not contain the names of any informants. No confidences will be violated by its disclosure.

Now let us understand it—this entire letter deals with the activities, the associations, and indiscretions, if you please, of Dr. Edward U. Condon. This letter is a report from the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation about the activities and associations of one of the key Government officials. What is there in the letter the President, the Attorney General, and Secretary Harriman desire to keep from the Congress? They have defied a subpoena of this House in order to cover up these facts. If they are so convinced of Dr. Condon's fitness and loyalty, and do not consider him a security risk in these perilous times, then why, in fairness to him and in fairness to the Congress and the people, do they not release the content of Mr. Hoover's letter?

Now, I would like to say a few words about this unanimous decision of the Department of Commerce Loyalty Board—the members of which were appointees of Henry Agard Wallace—which was supposed to have been made February 24. After the Secretary of Commerce refused to submit Mr. Hoover's letter, we subpoenaed before us the three members of the Department of Commerce Loyalty Board, the Secretary of the Board, the Under Secretary of Commerce, the shorthand reporter of the Board, the investigating officer of the Board and the Solicitor of the Department of Commerce, and while they all informed us that they had been instructed by Mr. Harriman not to give any testimony regarding Dr. Condon, we did determine the following facts, which I think are very important:

First. It developed that Dr. Condon was not unanimously cleared by the Loyalty Board on February 24, as Mr. Foster announced, but he was, in fact, unanimously cleared several hours after the issuance of the subcommittee's report on March 1.

Second. That two members of this Board were not employees of the Department of Commerce when their finding was made, and in order to make it unanimous, one of the former employees was called by telephone in Illinois and permission to place his name on the Board's decision was obtained.

Third. It developed that the Department of Commerce Loyalty Board had been considering the case of Dr. Condon for 10 months; that they reached their decision as a result of the report of May 15, 1947, from J. Edgar Hoover, supplemented by a report of one investigator employed by the Department of Commerce.

Now in this important case, they called one witness during the entire 10 months. That one witness was Dr. Condon. In other words, during this 10 months that Dr. Condon was under investigation, no steps were taken by the Loyalty Board or the officials of the Department of

Commerce, to deny him access to top secret material on atomic energy. As a matter of fact, in October of 1947, while the Board was considering Dr. Condon, and after they had received J. Edgar Hoover's letter, they permitted Dr. Condon to attend secret meetings at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and here is what is important about this unanimous opinion of the Loyalty Board. The Chairman of the Loyalty Board, Mr. Adrian S. Fisher, who is now General Counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission, having resigned as Solicitor of the Department of Commerce on February 25, testified before us that his board made a finding purely as to the individual loyalty of Dr. Condon. In other words, they made no finding as to whether through his associations, his affiliations or his indiscretions, he was a security risk, or unfit for the strategic position he held. The very essence of our report concerning Dr. Condon had to do with his associations, affiliations, and indiscretions. We did not charge Dr. Condon with being disloyal. We clearly stated that there was no evidence that Dr. Condon was a Communist, but we did state that Dr. Condon had been associating with individuals who were agents of the Soviet Government. In other words, so far as the Loyalty Board is concerned, Dr. Condon, a person who had access to highly confidential data, can associate every night with Soviet espionage agents, entertain them and be entertained by them, visit their embassies, their homes, entertain them in turn at his Government-owned home at the Bureau of Standards, associate with them socially and he and his family may hold membership in Communist front organizations. They do not take these matters into consideration in reaching their decision. They make their determination purely on whether or not he, as an individual, is loyal to the United States. He might be negligent and irresponsible in his conduct—they do not take that into consideration. They do not take into consideration whether or not he constitutes a security risk. To emphasize this point let me read you what the Chairman of the Commerce Department Loyalty Board said in this connection:

Mr. NIXON. What we want to know is what your Board has decided. As I understand it, then, from my question, your Board has decided only the narrow issue of individual loyalty of the man before you.

Mr. FISHER. That is correct.

Mr. NIXON. In other words, you have not made a decision one way or the other as to whether the man before you—and understand this is theoretical because I do not want you to refuse to answer this—whether or not the man before you may have been guilty of indiscreet associations over a period of time, and might, for that reason, be a questionable security risk for top secret documents.

Mr. FISHER. May I cite a supposititious case which, I think, will clear it up. Let me assume we had a case of a man, I will say.

Mr. NIXON. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. Economic conservative also, if I may state this, a religious man, and a southerner of which there are not economically radical people, I think. Yet, he had the bad habit of getting drunk, telling all he knew whenever he was given a drink. I think that is a supposititious case.

Mr. NIXON. Right.

Mr. FISHER. It is my interpretation under the Executive order that in that case we would have no alternative but to state his failings—

Mr. NIXON. But to clear the man for loyalty. Mr. FISHER. That is correct. His failings are not before us.

I say that the issue here is not whether Dr. Condon fundamentally is loyal. The question is, can we entrust the very security of our Nation in the hands of an individual who apparently sees nothing wrong in associating with card-holding members of the Communist Party, with associating with persons who are known to be agents of the Soviet Union, and who affiliates with an organization which is in control of Communists? Is he not placing the security and the welfare of the people of the United States in jeopardy through such associations? If Dr. Condon, as a private scientist, wishes to engage in activities in which I know he has been engaged, that is his business, but when he, as a director of the Bureau of Standards, engages in this activity, it becomes not only the concern of the Congress of the United States, but likewise the concern of every citizen of this country. We are playing for keeps now, and misfeasance can be just as disastrous as malfeasance.

In making this statement, I call upon the President to "unfreeze" Mr. Hoover's letter of May 15. Let the Congress and the people see what J. Edgar Hoover reported to Mr. Harriman on May 15, 1947. Let us see what was in the file of Dr. Condon that caused Mr. Fisher, the Chairman of the Loyalty Board, to refer to it as "a hot potato" in his testimony before our committee.

As a result of this case, President Truman has seen fit to ring down an iron curtain between the important information in the files of the executive departments of the Government and the Congress. If we permit his action to go unchallenged, then we are surrendering one of our historic prerogatives, that of the investigative authority of the Congress.

In the Washington Post of Thursday, March 25, 1948, there is an article on page 1, under the byline of Alfred Friendly. I want to read to you a portion of this article:

The subcommittee report on Condon was released on March 1. Two days later, the Washington Post disclosed that when the subcommittee quoted in part from the now famous Hoover letter, it omitted a key sentence. It was not until yesterday, however, that it was discovered that the subcommittee also inserted three sentences which Hoover did not write.

The passage is a supposed summary of passport applications of Dr. and Mrs. Condon for foreign travel. Sources known to be familiar with the text of the Hoover letter assert that the sentences do not appear in that communication.

The Commerce Department has refused a request of the Un-American Activities Committee Subcommittee to make the Hoover letter public.

Here we have a strange situation indeed. We find that the Washington Post is able to refer freely to a document which has been denied to the people's representatives in Congress. The Washington Post is able to say what this document contains and what it does not contain,

yet the Congress is refused by the Department of Commerce and Secretary Harriman the right to learn anything whatsoever concerning it. At precisely what point does the people's rights in this regard end and the privileges of the Washington Post begin? This situation calls for a thorough investigation and removal from office of all responsible and condoning parties, including the Secretary of Commerce, if he fails to take action immediately.

What is there in the file of an official of the Government, or an employee of the Government, that should not be subject to inspection by Members of Congress? To say that we who create these agencies and appropriate the money for their operations do not have an obligation to determine whether or not these agencies are being properly administered or whether the employees of these agencies are loyal or disloyal, or whether or not they constitute a security risk, is absurd. Certainly these are matters of pertinent inquiry to the committees of Congress. The country would never have known about the Teapot Dome or Benny Myers or Gerhart Eisler or Hanns Eisler, if the Congress had not had access to the files of the executive branch of the Government.

The very authority of the Congress has been defied. It is incumbent upon us to override the President's action and the dangerous precedent thereby established.

Your committee has described Dr. Condon as "one of the weakest links in our atomic security." If there are weaker links in our security chain and the same Presidential and departmental safeguards are thrown up to protect them from exposure, the committee can only suggest that the Congress and the people of the United States join together in the fervent prayer, "God help America."

[From the Washington Times-Herald of March 21, 1948]

WHO SMEARED SCIENCE?

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Who smeared science? Who has got people wondering about the loyalty of scientists to the Government of the United States?

On September 5, 1945, a little man walked into the office of the Ottawa (Canada) Journal.

His English was terrible. He had under his arms a large package of papers written in a foreign language. His story was fantastic.

He said that he was a code clerk at the Russian Embassy and that he wanted to report the existence of a Russian spy ring operating out of the Embassy. The papers, he said, were proof of the spy ring's work, documents that he had encoded and decoded.

The Ottawa Journal decided he was a "nut" and threw him out. He tried again the next day. No luck. He tried the Canadian Government. Still no luck. That night, September 6, 1945, he took his baby out of apartment 4, at 511 Somerset Street, Ottawa, to the next-door apartment of Sgt. Harold W. Main, of the Royal Canadian Air Force, and asked Main to look after the child because he, the code clerk, expected to be killed before the night was over.

But Sergeant Main had more sense than the Ottawa Journal or the Government of Canada, both of which had flatly refused to listen to the little man.

Sergeant Main went on a bicycle for the neighborhood cops.

The cops came around to apartment 4, at 511 Somerset Street, shortly after 11 p. m., September 6, 1945, and there found:

Vitali G. Pavlov, second secretary of the Soviet Embassy and chief of the Soviet secret service in Canada, Lt. Pavel Angelov, assistant military attaché, Lieutenant Colonel Rogov, air attaché, and Alexander Farantov, cipher clerk.

They had broken in and were tearing up the apartment. One was under the bed. One was in the clothes closet.

They were after those papers the little man had been trying so desperately to push into the hands of Canada. Thus broke the greatest spy case in North America, and it may yet turn out to be the most important in world history.

For the little man with the papers was Igor Gouzenko, the Embassy's code clerk. The papers were evidence of how the Soviets had stolen samples of uranium with which the United States of America had been making atom bombs. And of how they had stolen military secrets on radar, radio, high explosive, and other scientific weapons of war.

One of the papers the little man had was a coded cablegram to the headquarters of Soviet espionage in Moscow, reading:

"To the Director:

"Facts given by Alek: (1) The test of the atom bomb was conducted in New Mexico (with '49,' '94-239'). The bomb dropped on Japan was made of uranium 235.

"It is known that the output of uranium 235 amounts to 400 grams daily at the magnetic separation plant at Clinton. The output of '49' is likely two times greater (some graphite units are established, planned for 250 mega watts, i. e., grams, each day). The scientific work in this field is scheduled to be published but without the technical details. The Americans already have a published book on this subject.

"Alex (note: Spelling is from the original—FCW.) handed over to us a platinum with 162 micrograms of uranium 233 in the form of oxide in a thin lamina. We have had no news about the mail.

"Grant."

Decoded and translated, that message said that a Russian spy had furnished Russia with samples of United States atom-bomb material.

The name of the spy was Alan Nunn May. Dr. May was an Englishman of the upper class, a professor in nuclear physics at ancient and honorable Cambridge university. His family had an ancient and honorable name in Britain. Dr. May was one of Britain's trusted scientific experts on the bomb, frequently in Washington, D. C., during the war.

And he was a Soviet spy. So much so, in fact, that the head of the Soviet spy ring in Ottawa, a Col. Gregory Zabotin, got a direct cable from Moscow to expect May's arrival.

May's spy name was "Alek." Zabotin's spy name was "Grant." And "the director" was the spy headquarters in Moscow.

Dr. May is now doing 10 years in a British prison. He should have been shot for the traitor he was. Numerous other scientists in the very heart of United States-Canadian war work, some Canadians by birth, some British by birth, were all caught in the same net he was.

They are doing time in various Canadian prisons as traitors.

Who smeared science in this case?

One further question: Where did Alan Nunn May get that sample of uranium he slipped to Spymaster Zabotin in Ottawa, Canada?

Uranium for bombs was manufactured only in the United States of America. And May was down here. Who gave him that stuff? There is but one answer possible.

What has science to say for itself? When the first atom bomb drops on America, science can accept the credit, for it was a scientists who gave the uranium to Russia in 1945.

Gentlemen of science, speak up.

[From the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call of Monday, March 8, 1948]

TO RELAX NOW MAY MEAN TO WEEP LATER

Dr. Edward Condon, whose alleged association with Soviet agents is under congressional scrutiny, blithely advises us that he is "entirely reliable" and that "the country can relax." However, there is something in the record against him now before the House Un-American Activities Committee which makes us question the soundness of his advice.

Being Director of the United States National Bureau of Standards, Dr. Condon has access to all our atomic science records and files, and as a scientist has confidential knowledge of the mysteries of the atomic bomb, the one weapon Stalin longs for to speed up the Communist program of Europe's and then the world's subjugation. He of all people should be so beyond suspicion of disloyalty that no voice from any governmental quarter could be raised against him. Not only should he be "not disloyal" as he claims. He should be positively and passionately loyal to the United States, whose Government he is serving in so responsible a position of trust.

But the congressional committee, thank heavens, is not so easily taken off guard, for they have garnered evidence of questionable associations which belie his assurance that "the country can relax." This evidence points to some of his friends and intimates as "alleged Soviet espionage agents." It points to contacts with men and women, who while American citizens are said to be members of the Communist Party, and also to representatives of the Soviet and her satellite nations. It has reference to his membership in a society affiliated with an organization branded by the United States Attorney General himself as subversive.

Certainly these associations of Dr. Condon are not very conducive to inspiring public confidence in his assertion that "the country can relax," while he flits about among those who make no secret of their intent to overthrow our American democracy. Our Congress is right therefore in calling the administration to task for thus letting down its guard at so critical a moment in our Nation's history. It is surely not the time to throw our vigilance out of the window by giving to indiscreet officials in high places, with atomic bombs in their pockets, the benefit of every doubt. With Communist plotters to the east, west, north, and south of us, even cause for the slightest doubt calls for a searching and never-relaxing investigation.

Washington's patriotic advice to be vigilant in the hour of danger won us our liberty. Dr. Condon's unpatriotic advice to relax is the surest way of having it stolen from us.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for his very excellent and very factual and very informative statement on this matter. May I also ask the gentleman from Illinois if he has taken cognizance of the many, many accusations to the effect that the committee has attacked scientists all over the Nation, and that scientists have been warned they may be subject to attacks and smears and one thing and another?

Mr. VAIL. I am quite aware of that.

Mr. McDOWELL. I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois knows how many scientists have been named in any mat-

ters ever issued by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. VAIL. I recall of no other scientist.

Mr. McDOWELL. There were two, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, the moon-gazing, left-wing, fellow-traveling gentleman from Harvard University, Dr. Harlow Shapley, and Dr. Condon.

There is one other matter that ought to be cleared up. The accusation has been made by some radio commentators than an irresponsible subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities issued this release. I would like to point out that the subcommittee consists, of course, of the gentleman from Illinois, who is known to the other members of the committee as being one of the most energetic, one of the most able fact-finders, one of the hardest working members of the committee and also one of the most conservative members of the committee. The other two members of the committee consist of the chairman of the full committee who has been a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities ever since it was first established in 1938. The third member of the committee was the minority member, the Honorable JOHN S. WOOD, of Georgia, known to this House for many years for his integrity, his ability, and who most certainly as chairman of the full committee was cautious about those things he did.

Again I wish to thank the gentleman from Illinois.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1948— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. EATON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 31, 1948, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5314. An act to strengthen national security and the common defense by providing for the maintenance of an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 2, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1431. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1432. A letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Alien Registration Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1433. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 28, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Noyo River and Harbor, Calif., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 586); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1434. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report and findings on the Cachuma unit of the Santa Barbara County project, California (H. Doc. No. 587); to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1435. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision for a contract authorization of \$375,000,000 for the Treasury Department, in the form of an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1949 (H. Doc. No. 588); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1648. An act to authorize the expenditure of income from Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for training of Federal prisoners; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1653). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STEVENSON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. House Joint Resolution 347. Joint resolution to authorize the Postmaster General to withhold the awarding of star-route contracts for a period of 60 days; without amendment (Rept. No. 1654). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1235. An act for the relief of Merchants Trapier Rogers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1623). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1307. An act for the relief of Edward Trapier Rogers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1312. An act for the relief of Jeanette C. Jones and minor children; without amendment (Rept. No. 1625). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FOOTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 371. A bill for the relief of Jeness C. Thomas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1626). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 564. A bill for the relief of Sarah Lee Cregg; without amendment (Rept. No. 1627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 636. A bill for the relief of Knox Lumber Sales Co., Thomson, Ga.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 838. A bill for the relief of Frank

J. Patzke, Archie Mitchell, J. L. Shoemaker, Einar Engen, and N. L. Gifford; with amendments (Rept. No. 1629). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1303. A bill for the relief of E. La Ree Smoot; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1630). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1779. A bill for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation, of Winona, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1801. A bill for the relief of Mose Altman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1632). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2131. A bill for the relief of Fred E. Gross; without amendment (Rept. No. 1636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2785. A bill for the relief of the New Amsterdam Casualty Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1634). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2918. A bill for the relief of the Summer County Colored Fair Association; without amendment (Rept. No. 1635). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3007. A bill for the relief of Ernest F. Lutzken; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3114. A bill for the relief of the estate of John Delman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1637). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3189. A bill for the relief of Joe Parry, with amendments (Rept. No. 1638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3261. A bill for the relief of Capt. Carroll C. Garretson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1639). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3553. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1640). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3644. A bill for the relief of James M. Dingwall, Eileen Reynolds, W. G. Peterson, Bert Woollslayer, and Maisie Purser Davis; with amendments (Rept. No. 1641). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3931. A bill for the relief of James W. Keith; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1642). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4518. A bill for the relief of Gerald S. Furman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1643). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4602. A bill for the relief of Forest L. Weatherly; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1644). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4718. A bill for the relief of Louis Brown; without amendment (Rept. No. 1645). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5330. A bill for the relief of W. W. DeLoach; without amendment (Rept. No. 1646). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5387. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Department of the Treasury who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions and whose claims for such losses have been considered and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendations of a Treasury claim board; without amendment (Rept. No. 1647). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1263. An act for the relief of Fire District No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1648). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3497. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shirley Leinwand; without amendment (Rept. No. 1649). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3740. A bill for the relief of Andrew Osiecinski Ozapski; without amendment (Rept. No. 1650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4199. A bill for the relief of George Haniotis; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1651). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4484. A bill for the relief of Theodore Loetsch; without amendment (Rept. No. 1652). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6085. A bill to amend section 26 of the Shipping Act of 1916; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 6086. A bill to define partnerships and partners for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 6087. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 6088. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act so as to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase home loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 6089. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, Public Law 134; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 6090. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 6091. A bill to withdraw certain land as available land within the meaning of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 (42 Stat. 108), as amended, and to restore it to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee of Public Lands.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 6092. A bill to authorize the erection of additional facilities at the existing Veterans' Administration facility at Amarillo, Tex.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 6093. A bill to amend section 26 of the Shipping Act of 1916; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD:

H. R. 6094. A bill to authorize the United States during an emergency period to undertake its fair share in the resettlement of displaced persons and expellees by permitting their admission into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 6095. A bill to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H. R. 6096. A bill to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa; Kansas City, Mo.; and Omaha, Nebr.; for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 6097. A bill to authorize the furnishing of water to the Yuma auxiliary project, Arizona, through the works of the Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 6098. A bill to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industrial productive capacity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 6099. A bill to provide for a national program of old-age retirement, survivors, and permanent disability insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NODAR:

H. R. 6100. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for patients in or at veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6101. A bill to extend for 3 years the period in which first-class letter mail matter may be transmitted free of postage by members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6102. A bill increasing the immigration quotas for Greece; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 6103. A bill to repeal the exemption from income tax now existing in favor of certain cooperative associations and corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. Res. 518. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on Education and Labor; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Kentucky memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning the acquisition and maintenance, as a national shrine, of the Albert Sidney Johnston home, the old courthouse and old post office located in the town of Washington, in Mason County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 6104. A bill for the relief of Thomas Faless; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 6105. A bill for the relief of Serapio Zabala-Arrien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1708. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of sundry citizens for passage of such legislation as may be required for the reduction of shipping rates to stricken foreign countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1709. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition signed by Mrs. William J. Hamilton and 33 other citizens of Salem, Oreg., urging the abolition of the tax on yellow margarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1710. Also, petition signed by Mr. C. A. McCall and 33 other citizens of Salem, Oreg., urging the abolition of the tax on yellow margarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1711. By Mr. WELCH: California State Senate Resolution 30, memorializing Congress to take such steps as may be necessary to increase the compensation of the postal employees sufficiently to enable them to meet the enormously increased cost of living; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1712. Also, California State Senate Resolution 39, memorializing Congress to adopt the resolution proposed by Representative WELCH asking that the Army, Navy, and Interior Department engineers study the possibility of building a dam at the northern end of San Francisco Bay to separate the salt water of the Pacific from the fresh water of the two rivers; to the Committee on Public Works.

1713. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Board of Selectmen of Holliston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to amending the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1714. Also, petition of Henry M. Barnhart, Mount Dora, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1715. Also, petition of Mrs. Maude M. Gibson, Orlo Vista, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1716. Also, petition of Mrs. Ruey E. Collins, St. Cloud, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1717. Also, petition of Leslie D. Sallor and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 2, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, March 29, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, let us never be ashamed to come to Thee in prayer, for we are Thy children, Thou art our Father.

Together we pray for the Members of this body who need the healing ministry of the Great Physician and for their